

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management :

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.* Prof. J. P. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, *LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.E.S.L.* With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association. Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. O. FLAMSTEAD, *WALTERS, M.A.* Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*
With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXXI

MAY, JUNE, 1917

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS :		PAGE	REVIEWS :		PAGE
The Homeric Hymns.	T. L. AGAR ..	65	Sandys, <i>The Odes of Pindar.</i>	W. M. L. HUTCHINSON	98
Hesiod: <i>Works and Days</i> , ll. 455-7.	HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE	68	Brock's <i>Galen on the Natural Faculties.</i>	CLIFFORD ALLBUTT	100
General Relative Clauses in Greek.	J. A. SMITH	69	Walters, Conway, and Daniel's <i>Deigma, a First Greek Book.</i>	R. B. APPLETON	103
The Greek Question: A Lesson from Scotland.	I. J. HARROWER	71	Grenfell and Hunt's <i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri.</i>	W. H. D. ROUSE	104
Classical Metres for English Poetry.	OXONIENSIS	73	Clerc's <i>Aquae Sextiae</i> and Bourne's <i>A Study of Tibur, Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Roman Empire.</i>	H. STUART JONES	106
On the Prospective Use of the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive in Relative Clauses.	W. J. GOODRICH	83	Housman's <i>Manilius</i> , Book III.	H. W. GARROD	107
Further Remarks on Propertius.	J. S. PHILLIMORE	86	OBITUARY		108
NOTES:			NOTES AND NEWS		110
Diogenes Laertius I. 104 and I. 77.	A. S. FERGUSON	97	CORRESPONDENCE		112
Leucas—Ithaca.	G. C. RICHARDS	97	BOOKS RECEIVED		112

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Acting Hon. Secretary, Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. A. B. Herford, The University, Manchester; Miss M. W. U. Robertson, The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss D. Watson, 7, Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and Mrs. R. M. Gray, 13, Marine Lines, Bombay.

TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL

Representative of the Teaching Profession
(Constituted by Order in Council, February 29, 1912).

In accordance with the above-mentioned Order,

A REGISTER OF TEACHERS

is now maintained by the Council.

For Information apply to THE SECRETARY, TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL,
47, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

EIDOLA POEMS

BY
FREDERIC MANNING

AUTHOR OF
"SCENES AND PORTRAITS"

2s. 6d. net

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C.

The Classical Review

MAY, JUNE, 1917

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

VIII.

Hymn. Dem. 342 :

τέτμε δὲ τὸν γε ἄνακτα δόμων ἔντοσθεν ἔντα
ἤμερον ἐν λεχέεσσι σὺν αἰδοίῃ παρακοίτι
πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη μητρὸς πόθῳ· ἡ δ' ἔπει' ἀτλήτων
ἔργοις θεῶν μακάρων μητίστο βουλῇ.†

In our first line

Τέτμε δὲ ὦν γε ἄνακτα δόμων ἔντοσθεν

might be read with much advantage and but slight deviation from the tradition : ' He found the King within his own palace.' The last two lines, containing the obeli of Messrs. Allen and Sikes, have evoked many conjectures which need not be given here in detail, still less discussed. The difficulties are serious, but Baumeister's despair of any solution is an exaggeration of them. That Ilgen's ἀποτηλοῦ rightly restores τ' ἐπ' ἀτλήτων is highly probable, and few can doubt that βουλῇ represents an original βουλῆν. The real crux of the passage is in the corrupt word ἔργοις. My firm opinion is that, metre apart, the retention of ἔργοις θεῶν μακάρων 'because of the deeds of the blessed gods' (Evelyn-White) is quite impossible. It could not be reconciled with the main story, in which the responsibility for the act of Aidoneus is definitely fixed upon Zeus alone (77) :

οὐδέ τις ἄλλος

αἴτιος ἀθανάτων, εἰ μὴ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς.

I will now set down the sentence as I suggest it may have stood before the carelessness or ignorance of copyists succeeded in developing the present confusion :

ἡ δ' ἀποτηλοῦ

νόσφι θεῶν μακάρων ὅλην μητίστο βουλῆν.

This describes in general terms the
NO. CCLXIV. VOL. XXXI.

action of Demeter, as set forth in detail in the passage (303-12) beginning

ἐνθα καθεζομένη μακάρων ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἀπάντων. . . .

Compare also 351-6, where again her aloofness from the other Olympians is made prominent (354) :

ἡ δ' αἰνὸν ἔχει χόλον, οὐδὲ θεοῖσι
μίγνυται, ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθε. . . .

The insertion of ὅλην before μητίστο is a suggestion originally made by Hermann, *cf. Od.* XI. 276 θεῶν ὅλοας διὰ βουλίας. It is quite possible that the corruption of this clause had its origin in a pious desire to eliminate this offensive epithet, for so it might be regarded at Eleusis or at Athens. It is a sort of ἀπρεπές, *v. Homericæ*, Preface, p. viii. We have an interesting illustration in l. 414 :

ὥς δέ μ' ἀναρπάξας Κρονίδεω πυκινῇ διὰ μήτιν. . . .

Persephone is here speaking of the violence of which she has been the victim. Now would any poet in his senses make the victim of such an outrage refer to it as the outcome of wise counsel on the part of her own father? There could hardly be a greater breach of dramatic propriety. The poet wrote

ὥς δέ μ' ἀναρπάξας Κρονίδεω ὅλην διὰ μήτιν,

and an ignorant corrector, mindful of Ζηνὸς πυκινόφρονα βουλῆν (*Herm.* 538) and the like, but knowing nothing of early epic metre, complacently spoiled the line in two ways by substituting in the interest of Zeus πυκινῇ for ὅλην.

* * *

Corrections of the erroneous verbal forms in 348, 297, 208 and 191 have

E

been indicated in *Homeric*, p. 364, and can hardly be questioned, but

366 τιμὰς δὲ σχήσῃσθα μετ' ἀθανάτοισι μεγίστας
presents an issue that is much more problematical. Perhaps the abnormal σχήσῃσθα may have come by a transposition of letters \widehat{XC} from

τιμὰς δ' ἐξῆς σχήσθα μ. α. μ.

The σχήσῃσθα we sometimes see here is a conjectural atrocity. The passage proceeds,

τὼν δ' ἀδικησάντων πλοῖς ἔσσεται ἡματα πάντα,

but we may be quite sure, if only from the unepic τὼν ἀδικησάντων, that this denouncement of eternal punishment is not to be attributed to the hymn-writer. He wrote:

σοὶ δ' ἀδικησάντων (οἱ σὴ δ' ἀ.).

'The punishment of wrong-doers shall be in thy hands for ever,' which is a very different matter. In the next line Allen and Sikes gratuitously edit the erroneous form *θυσίαισι*, for which wiser editors give *θυσίῃσι*, though Hermann's *θυέεσσι* is probably right. In 312 *θυέων* is absolutely necessary as anyone may see, cf. *Il.* VI. 270 and particularly IX. 499, where Plato (*Rep.* ii. 364 D), a better authority than the Moscow MS., erroneously reads *καὶ τοὺς μὲν θυσίαισι* (two modernisations), and Vi² has in the same line *εὐχολαΐσιν ἀγαναΐσι*, which no one heeds or is likely to heed.

Again in 369, as also in 274, *εὐ ἀγίως τ' ἐρδοντες* is far more likely to be right than *εὐαγέως* of the corrupt and untrustworthy tradition.

* * *
12 τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ βίης ἑκατὸν κάρη ἐξεπεφύκει,
† κῶδῳ τ' ὁδμῇ τ' ὅρανος εὐρύς ὑπερθε
γαῖα τε πᾶς ἐγέλασσε καὶ ἄλμυρον οἶμα θαλάσσης.

In *Hermathena* 1894 the late Professor Tyrrell, εἴ τις καὶ ἄλλος, a most accomplished and elegant scholar, now *valde defunctus*, wrote a short paper of emendations of the Homeric Hymns. Professor Tyrrell's remarks are always worthy of respect and attention, nor will his reputation suffer even if it should be proved that his ingenious suggestion,

κῶδ' ἥδιστ' ὁδμῇ,

in l. 13 is untenable. But so far as this may be the consequence, Mr. Allen has unwittingly done him a distinct

disservice by selecting this solitary instance of his critical work and giving it admission into the text. I say 'solitary,' for in *Herm.* 33 Matthiae has the priority with *ἔσσο*.

My objections to the emendation may now be stated: (i.) The loss of the two letters ζη between the ω and the δ is a rather serious assumption, quite different from the interchange of *πρῶτα* and *πρώτιστα* (*Apoll.* 407), *τέκε* and *τέκετο* (*Apoll.* 42), *γελάσασα* and *γελοιύσασα* (*Apoll.* 49). (ii.) The sentence obtained is brief and bald to a degree, telegraphic rather than poetic. (iii.) The crasis of *καί* is alien to the old epic. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* this is certainly the case. The three or five possible instances (*v. Homerica* γ 255) would have been multiplied more than a hundredfold, if the crasis had been really tolerable. They are due to misapprehension and manifest later corruption. Even if there be a doubt on this point—I submit there is none—the manufacture of examples by conjecture is certainly to be deprecated. (iv.) There is no epic warrant at all for *ὄζω*: *ὄδωδα* alone is found in use, and the perfect by no means implies the existence of any such form as *ὄζω*. (v.) *ἥδιστα*, were it not for the elision before it in defiance of an initial digamma (*v. Homerica* θ 64), might be welcomed on making its first appearance here in the old epic literature. (vi.) The accent on *ὁδμῇ* in M shows definitely that the writer of the MS. was intending and copying a dative, not a nominative case. (vii.) Lastly, there is a simpler and more acceptable remedy, pointed to by the tradition itself and the emendations of many scholars from Ruhnken to Ludwig:

κνωδῆς τ' ὁδμῇ πᾶς οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθε
γαῖα τε πᾶς ἐγέλασσε καὶ ἄλμυρον οἶμα θαλάσσης.

In 122 we find Δῶς for Δηώ (47) and the confusion of η and ι is particularly common, cf. 26 *Ἵπερίημος*, 107 *κάλπησι*, 314 *Ἥρην*, 343 *παρακοίτη* for *Ἵπερίονος*, *κάλπισι*, *Ἴριν* and *παρακοίτι* respectively. Further than this I remove δ' after πᾶς, not a very serious matter in such a case or in any case.

The above considerations taken together make an unanswerable indictment

ment against the reading which has now appeared in the text of three English editions of the *Hymns*, a reading which ought never to have got further than, even if so far as, the *Annotatio Critica*.

A much better conjecture of Tyrrell's may be found in l. 17, where for

Νύσιον ἄμ πεδίον τῇ δρῶσε ἀναξ πολυδέγμων
he suggests, omitting Νύσιον (imported perhaps from l. 8):

ἄμ πεδίον τῇ δρῶσε ἀναξ κρατερὸς πολυδέγμων,
Cf. 430 where *χώρησ'*, *ἐξέθορεν* δὲ would mend the metre materially.

* * *
137 ὥς ἐθέλονσι τοκῆς· ἐμὲ δ' αὖτ' οἰκτεῖρατε, κοῦραι.

There are two absurdities in this verse, the metre and the appeal for pity. Sympathy and pity the goddess has had already without the asking, v. 113-7. Here she is declaring her capacity to earn her own living, and merely wants to know whose house she has come to.

There is, in fact, no need to assume a lacuna of any kind after this line. It is obvious at a glance that *οἰκτεῖρατε* is merely an attempt to get some little meaning out of the fortuitous fusion of the diphthong of *μοι* or *ἐμοί* with *ἐκείπατε*. Then superadded to this blunder, almost necessitated by it we might say, comes the brilliant idea to scan *τοκῆς* as *τοκεῖς* or the Attic *τοκῆς*, to accommodate *ἐμὲ* forsooth. Cobet practically solved the puzzle such as it is (v. Allen and Sikes *ad loc.*) by proposing *ἐμοὶ δ' αὖτ' εἴπατε*. I suggest

ἐμοὶ δ' ἐξείπατε, κοῦραι, . . .

There is a much more difficult line further on in this speech of Demeter's which ends thus (143-4):

καὶ κε λῆχος στορέσασμαι μυχῷ θαλάμων ἐνπύκτων
δεσπόσσων, καὶ κ' ἔργα ῥ' διαθήσασμαι γυναικός.

First of all we may safely eliminate κ', mischievous, because it could not stand thus elided before *ἔργα* and needless, because the *κε* in 143 is naturally operative for both verbs, cf. 141-2. Instead of *διαθήσασμαι* Voss's conjecture *διδασκῆσασμαι*, followed of course by *γυναικας*, though generally adopted, cannot, to say the least, be unreservedly approved. Apart from the fact that the function so described would in all

probability involve the exertion of greater physical powers than an old woman (*γυνὴ ἀφῆλιξ*) would possess, the aorist form *ἐδιδάσκησα* for *ἐδίδαξα* is quite unepic. It can claim only one tiny ray of support from Hes. *Op.* 64, where the texts read,

ἔργα διδασκῆσαι, πολυδαίδαλον ἱστὸν ὑφαίνειν·

But there can be little doubt that Origen's *διδασκόμεναι* is right, for no Greek of his period would be likely to introduce by conjecture such a form. Here *διδασκῆσαι* is the variant of D (Rzach), and Allen and Sikes remark that *διδασκῆσασμαι* would be little removed from *διαθήσασμαι*. My conjecture then is this:

καὶ ἔργαδ' ἀναστήσασμαι γυναικας.

'and I would call up the women to their work.'

This would be an employment in every way suitable to the assumed character of the goddess. The corruption would arise from the words being divided *ἔργα δαναστήσασμαι*, which inevitably suggests that the verb began with the preposition *δια-* and had for its direct object *ἔργα*, with the necessary consequence that *γυναικας* becomes *γυναικός*. "Ἐργα *διδασκῆσασμαι* would, in those late days when *ἔθισα* was permissible, be thought well altered to the *ἔργα διαθήσασμαι* of the tradition, which, metre apart, is apparently quite good for 'I would arrange a woman's work.'

It is well known that in our manufacturing towns the work-people regularly employ a knocker-up who goes round betimes to waken them every morning, rattling at their bedroom windows with a short length of wire attached to a long rod. He is usually a superannuated workman, *ἀφῆλιξ*. Demeter professes her readiness to undertake *mutatis mutandis* the same function.

* * *
53 καὶ ῥά οἱ ἀγγελέουσα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε·

Ruhnken very properly altered this to *ἀγγέλλονσα*, which *pace* Allen and Sikes is certainly not 'virtually the same as the future.' The curious thing here is that the MS. should present *ἀγγελέουσα* at all. I believe the anomaly admits of a satisfactory explanation.

The tradition is really a closer approximation to the true reading than the more correct ἀγγέλλουσα would have been. Of the ten letters that form the word ἀγγελέουσα seven are, I believe, altogether right .γγ..εουσα, the true reading being,

καὶ ῥα οἱ ἐγγὺς ἐοῦσα

This fits in admirably with the preceding clause, ἤντετό οἱ Ἑκάτη, and with the more general consideration that Hecate's object was not to give information but to make a suggestion (v. VII. on ll. 54-8).

156 τῶν πάντων ἄλοχοι κατὰ δόματα πορσαίνουσι.

Here I would suggest ποιπνύουσι as probable. A homely expression applied to rulers and royalties always ran great risk of alteration at the hands of the later Greeks as being ἀπρεπές. The Pindaric πορσαίνω has no epic standing, and little to recommend it here beyond a vacuity which the reader may fill up as he may fancy within fairly wide limits.

168 and 223. For the usual ζηλώσαι· τόσα we might read with advantage and punctuate:

ζηλώσει, ὅσα κέν τοι . . . δαίη.

194 ἀλλ' ἀέουσα ἔμμε. . .

So Allen and Sikes, recognising no trammels of metre, *rerum metrarum scientia incredibili*, foolishly read. 'Ἀέουσα' ἀνέμμε is generally accepted by editors from Voss: so Abel, Gemoll, Evelyn-White. Formally, as involving no new letter, ἀέουσα' ἄμμε would perhaps be preferable.

279. For κατενήνοθεν ὤμους read κατενηνόθε' ὤμους.

See *Homericæ* p. 362 on ἄνωγα. So also in A 266 ἀνηνόθε' is necessary and in B 219, the mainstay of this corruption, read:

ψεδνή δ' ἐπενηνόθε' ἀχνη.

T. L. AGAR.

HESIOD: WORKS AND DAYS, LL. 455-7.

IN a discussion published in this Review (Vol. XXX., pp. 209 ff.) of Hesiod's description of winter I suggested incidentally that ll. 455-7 should be placed between ll. 426 and 427.¹ The proposed transfer is both textually and substantially too important to be acceptable *per se* without reason given, and the object of this note is to supply the defect.

Every intelligent reader must have felt puzzled by one of the sections on ploughing (ll. 448-457). After directions as to making a plough, the choice of a team, and the choice of a ploughman, the poet goes on to the season

¹ Lehrs (*Quaest. Ep.*, p. 196) first pointed out that these lines are out of place. Being on active service when I wrote this note, I was unaware that Steitz (*W. u. T. d. Hesiodos*, pp. 127 and 148) had anticipated my transfer. As he advances no arguments to support his change, and fails to connect the 'many curved timbers' (l. 427) with the waggon, my own remarks may be allowed to stand as an independent treatment.

for ploughing. 'Mark,' he says, 'the arrival of the crane, who gives the signal for ploughing, but pecks the heart of the teamless man. Then you must feed up your plough oxen.' So far all is well; but trouble comes with l. 453. 'For it is easy,' he continues, '[for the teamless man] to say, "Give me a yoke of oxen and a waggon"; but it is as easy to refuse and say: "I have work for my oxen." The unpractical man thinks his waggon is as good as made—the fool! He does not know that a hundred timbers go to a waggon. So take care to have these laid up beforehand.' Why should the man who wishes to plough try to borrow a waggon instead of a plough? And why give advice about timber for a cart in the middle of instructions on ploughing? The lines are therefore utterly inappropriate in their present place. And l. 457 surely gives final proof that they cannot stand here; for assuming for the moment that we can let the waggon

pass, would not the poet urge us to have this *built* in good time? Nothing of the sort: he says there are a hundred timbers to a waggon, so take care to have them *laid up* at home betimes.

This should be reason strong enough to satisfy the strictest that ll. 455-7 must be moved from their present place: clearly they belong to the wood-cutting section. Let us now see how they will fit between ll. 426-7. First and most obvious is the advantage gained by bringing together the separated notes on the waggon. Secondly, l. 457 is no longer awkward in a section which deals mainly with the finding, cutting and storing of timber. Again, in ll. 424 and 426 Hesiod mentions just two parts of the waggon: surely in view of his enumeration of the parts of the plough we might expect to hear something of the eight and ninety other timbers which (he tells us) go to a waggon. This we shall get if we insert ll. 455-7 between ll. 426 and 427, and, modifying the punctuation, read as follows:—

- 426 τρισπίθαμον δ' ἄψιν τάμνειν δεκα-
δώρω ἁμάξῃ.
455 φησὶ δ' ἀνὴρ φρένας ἀφνειὸς πῇ-
ξασθαι ἁμύξαν.
456 νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδ'· ἑκατὸν δέ τε
δούρατ' ἁμάξης.
457 τῶν πρόσθεν μελέτην ἔχμεν, οἰκῆϊα
θέσθαι
427 πολλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα.

If this is done, not only do we get something to represent the missing ninety-eight timbers, but we get rid of

the abrupt and verbless sentence of the received text πολλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα—a sentence moreover which omits to state for what purpose the 'many curved timbers' are to be used. In the text as reconstructed above, the ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα are possibly ribs or stays holding the sides and floor of the waggon in their relative positions, or better, planks for a rounded type of waggon such as Mr. Hardy in Chapter III. of *The Woodlanders* (p. 17: Macmillan Pocket Edition):

The four huge waggons . . . were built on those ancient lines whose proportions have been ousted by modern patterns, *their shapes* bulging and curving at the base *and ends like Trafalgar line-of-battle ships*, with which venerable hulks, indeed, these vehicles evidenced a constructive spirit curiously in harmony.

Doubtless ll. 455-7 fell out of their proper place owing to the triple homoeoteleuton, and were added subsequently at the foot of the page or column,¹ which may have coincided with l. 454. Or the lines added at the foot of the page may have been inserted after l. 454 by a copyist, who considered only the natural kinship between the 'teamless man' and the 'man rich in fancy.' Following this, ἁμύξαν (which is impossible in any case) was substituted for ἄροτρον at the end of l. 453 to secure consistency with the strayed ll. 455-7.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

¹ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 1358, fr. 2, furnishes an interesting example of this sort of scribal blunder.

GENERAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN GREEK.

THE proper interpretation of a sentence in Plato's *Republic* raises a question of Greek syntax, on which my own grammatical conscience gives no quite certain sound. May I appeal to those who have made the niceties of Greek syntax the object of special study for assistance towards a decision?

The sentence is in *Rep.* Book X. 596 A. There is no variation of reading in the MSS., nor has any doubt ever been raised about the text. Adam and

Burnet print it exactly alike even to the punctuation. The sentence runs in both εἶδος γὰρ πού τι ἐν ἑκαστον εἰώθαμεν τίθεσθαι περὶ ἕκαστα τὰ πολλά, οἷς ταῦτ' ὄνομα ἐπιφέρομεν. It may be convenient to quote Adam's translation in his note *ad loc.*: "for we are, as you know, in the habit of assuming an idea—always *one* idea—in connexion with each group of particulars to which we apply the same name"; lit. "an Idea, one each," *i.e.* each being one."

To students of the development of Plato's thought, the sentence is an important one, and much doctrine has been inferred from it. On any interpretation it formulates a principle of procedure, which is immediately applied in what follows. What is this principle? According to some we find in the sentence a formulation of the whole Theory of Ideas as Plato then—at the time of the composition of Book X.—held it, *i.e.* of 'the earlier Platonic Theory of Ideas.' It is believed that here Plato commits himself to the doctrine that there are just as many Ideas as, and no more than, there are groups-of-particulars-called-by-a-common-name, so that at the time he would have approved any and every inference from identity of denomination to an underlying Idea, and therefore would have included among groups of particulars, to which there corresponded an Idea, *artefacta*, negatives and relatives. On this view the main object of the sentence is (a) to give a rule for determining how many Ideas there are altogether, a secondary and subordinate aim being to remind us (b) that each such Idea is 'always one Idea.'

Now, if we are to take the sentence thus, and understand quite literally, the rule would oblige us to posit an Idea, and one only, even for groups or aggregates which were only *ἀπὸ τύχης ομόνομα*, and such a wild Nominalism no one would suppose Plato at any time to have held. Further, what follows shows that, while some form of the doctrine of Ideas is of course assumed, the whole emphasis is on (b) *supra*, viz. on the principle of method or procedure that where an Idea is posited, that Idea is always one and must not be divided or multiplied. It looks therefore as if this, viz. (b), and not (a), was the main object of our sentence, *i.e.* as if *ἐν* were the emphatic word and the real predicate. It is interesting to observe that in the words Adam appends to his translation this point is reiterated and stressed.

But does the sentence mean (a) at all? Can the Greek as it stands mean that each and every group of particulars that are named by a common name has an Idea corresponding to it?

It can only do so if the relative clause at the end is general, and characterises or determines a fixed collection of groups as its antecedent. Would this sense—this is the question which I propose to myself and others—not require either *ἄν* with the subjunctive or some other form of the relative, such as *οἷσιν* or *οἷσις*? Is it possible for a relative clause with the simple *ὅς* and its verb in the indicative to express generality or specify a group of groups (or, as Plato calls them, 'manifolds' or 'manys')? If it is not, then the doctrine (a) is not contained in the sentence even by implication; the main and whole meaning of the sentence is (b). In that case what are we to say of the relative clause? We must take it as a mere addition or appendage to the main clause, almost as if *οἷς* were equivalent to *καὶ τοῖτοις*. But for its position, it might be called a parenthetical remark; what is said in it is quite subordinate to the main sense and purpose of the sentence. It is, doubtless, some feeling of this which led both the editors to insert a comma before *οἷς* (but there is no corresponding comma in Adam's translation). I should therefore translate the whole sentence 'for we are, as you know, in the habit of assuming [as a rule of procedure] that the Idea which corresponds to a group of particulars, each to each, is always one, in which case [or, and in that case] we call the group of particulars by a common name.' If this way of taking the sentence is even possible, the attribution to Plato, on the strength of it, of 'the earlier Theory of Ideas' is invalid, *a fortiori* if it is the more probable or the only possible way.

The syntactical doctrine on which I rely is supported by that of Goodwin, *Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses*, §§ 532, 534.

I have in the above suggested translation left for the moment standing what I believe to be a further mis-translation, and of this I will now suggest a correction. The words *ταῦτον ὄνομα* have been generally understood to mean 'a common name,' *i.e.* a name common to all the individuals within the group. It appears to me that the

Greek for this would be *κοινὸν ὄνομα*, and that *ταῦτόν ὄνομα* would most naturally mean something else, *i.e.* 'the name as before,' *i.e.* the name of the *εἶδος*. I should therefore emend my translation to 'in which case we call the group, or its particulars, by the same name as the *εἶδος*.'

I hope, whether I am right or wrong in my interpretation, that I have made clear the difference between the two that have been suggested. What I desire to be furnished with is a clear instance or instances, if such exist, of a relative clause with the simple *ὅς* and the verb in the indicative, which characterises or determines its antecedent in the way in which it has here been assumed to determine those *πολλά*—all and no others—to which an Idea

corresponds. The decision of the question I propound is of some importance to students of the history of philosophy, for unless the clause has here that force, and indeed unless it can here have no other, out of the sentence there cannot be extracted, and ascribed to Plato, any principle which tells us how many Ideas there are, or any doctrine that there are only as many Ideas as there are groups to which an Idea corresponds; all that is said is that if there is an Idea that Idea is indiscernibly one, and must not be divided or multiplied. As a matter of fact, this is all that is assumed or used in the subsequent discussion.

J. A. SMITH.

Oxford.

THE GREEK QUESTION: A LESSON FROM SCOTLAND—I.

THE battle for Greek as a necessary part of a liberal education was lost in Scotland a quarter of a century ago, when the Ordinances of the Royal Commission on the Scottish Universities came into force. How futile has been the effort to maintain the position ever since the first line of defence was surrendered will be manifest from the following statement of facts.

The Ordinances in question reduced Greek to the rank of an option for the Arts Degree, but the friends of the subject on the Commission, among whom the late Professor Butcher was naturally prominent, succeeded in introducing a number of subsidiary regulations on which they relied for its safety. In the first place, Greek might be offered instead of Latin as one of four subjects necessary for the degree. Secondly, Greek and Latin together constituted one of three possible pairs, one of which had to be selected. Thirdly, Greek was compulsory on candidates for Honours in Mental Philosophy. Lastly, those candidates who offered Greek as one of their subjects in the Competition for Entrance Bursaries could secure a total of 1,800 marks as contrasted with the 1,600 possible for those who offered two Modern Languages. This last enact-

ment was regarded as a peculiarly strong buttress for the subject, owing to the fact that a large proportion of the annual entrants were competitors in the Bursary Examinations.

But the ink was hardly dry on the paper before the enemies of Greek were up in arms against the Ordinance. The cry of 'Protection' was raised against the position of Greek in the curriculum. Why, again, it was asked, should Greek and not German be required of Honours Philosophy men? Why, above all, should Greek be favoured in the Bursary Competitions at the expense of Modern Languages? It was useless to point to the analogy of other examinations—the semblance of injustice was a powerful weapon in the hands of the unscrupulous, and instead of enjoying a few years of peace for the development of their subject, the teachers of Greek in the Schools and Universities were plunged into a conflict even more acrimonious and distracting than that which had raged in the years before the appointment of the Commission.

The bulwark erected for us proved to be one of straw. After sixteen years of disquiet, during which some professed friends of Greek proved more dangerous than its open enemies, the whole struc-

ture of the Ordinance was battered out of shape. By the Enactments of the four Scottish University Courts passed in 1908, or soon after, a far wider freedom of options was granted for the Arts Degree, Greek lost the poor safeguards it had formerly enjoyed, and, as had long been prophesied, Latin, as a compulsory or virtually compulsory subject, went down along with it. One may now become a Master of Arts of a Scottish University without attending Classes or passing Degree Examinations in either Latin or Greek, or for the matter of that in several other of the subjects that were the backbone of the old Degree. It is also possible to graduate in Arts with no further knowledge of Latin than is implied in the possession of the Lower Leaving Certificate of the Scotch Education Department in that subject, the examination for which includes an easy passage of Latin for translation into English with questions in Parsing, ten short English sentences to be translated into Latin and two easy general questions. Greek, it is hardly necessary to say, is rarely offered as an option for Latin, and in the Examination for Bursaries it now counts no more than French.

But this was not all. A fresh blow was struck at the subject by the Regulations framed for its Intermediate Certificate Examination by the Scotch Education Department, which had the effect of crowding out Greek from the curriculum of the large majority of pupils till they had attained the age of sixteen. This left them two years for its study, but since the University Entrance Examinations demanded a pass in three other subjects besides, there was every temptation to avoid so hard a subject by carrying on with one already begun in the Intermediate stage. Ten years ago the Scottish Classical Association, after receiving very full evidence from the Schools, passed a resolution that in its

opinion the Regulations in question would seriously affect Classical studies, and would in particular endanger Greek. In 1912 a Committee appointed by the Association reported that in the session 1911-12, of the eighty-three grant-earning schools in Scotland, thirty-five had fewer than six pupils learning Greek, twenty had no beginners, and fifteen had one. Further that in fifty-four schools of the eighty-three, which furnished complete returns, there had been a decrease between 1906-7 and 1911-12 of 40 per cent. in those studying Greek, and a decrease of 40 per cent. in those presented for the Department's Lower Certificate in Greek, of 33 per cent. in those presented for the Higher, and of 38 per cent. in those beginning the subject.

In the same year I published a Map (with notes) of the Greekless Areas of Scotland which showed that there were large tracts of the country in which Greek was extinct. It had disappeared from the counties of Haddington, Wigtown and Kirkcudbright. It was taught in two schools in Perthshire where, forty years before, one small district could boast of five schools teaching Greek. In every county there was a shrinkage greater or less. Eleven counties were served by one Greek-teaching school apiece, and six others by two, and, not to drag out the miserable story to the bitter end, I was able to show from the Aberdeen University Records that between 1887 and 1906 there were 191 schools which had in one year or another sent students trained in Greek to our Bursary Competition. In 1912 all Scotland north of Perthshire and Forfarshire showed only twenty-eight Greek-teaching schools.

The effect of all this on the Universities is a subject that must be left over for the present.

J. HARROWER.

University of Aberdeen.

CLASSICAL METRES FOR ENGLISH POETRY.

The Oxford University Press will shortly publish *Ibant Obscuri, an Experiment in the Classical Hexameter*, by Robert Bridges. The book is described as an analysis of Virgil's rhythm and a line for line paraphrase of *Aen.* VI. 268-751, 893-8 ('The Vision of Aeneas'), with the Latin interlined, accompanied by a cento of previous translations, to which is added a paraphrase, also interlined, of Homer, II. XXIV. 339-660 ('Priam and Achilles').—*Times Literary Supplement*, December 21, 1916.

WHEN, more than fifty years ago, Matthew Arnold, as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, gave his lectures on the translation of Homer, he said that there were but three metres between which translators could choose, the ten-syllable couplet, blank verse, and the hexameter: and to give the 'flowing and abounding ease' which characterises Homer, neither the rhymed couplet of Pope with its didactic excellencies (though this flowed more easily and rapidly than Cowper's blank verse) nor the grandeur of Milton's blank verse were at all suitable. Against Shakespeare's best he had nothing to urge, except that no Shakespeare was likely to be forthcoming; and indeed for plainness and simplicity, two of Homer's essential characteristics, what could surpass:

Five hundred poor I have in yearly fee,
Who twice a day their withered hands hold up
Toward heaven to pardon blood; and I have
built
Two chantries where the sad and solemn priests
Sing still for Richard's soul.

Henry V. IV. i.

Tennyson's blank verse he rejected as too subtle and elaborate, but it is fair to him to say that Tennyson's consummate rendering of the last lines in *Iliad* VIII. had not then been published; and it was later still that Worsley brought out his beautiful rendering of Homer in the difficult Spencerian stanza.

Their exquisite translations of the same passage run thus:

And these all night upon the bridge of war
Sat glorying; many a fire before them blazed:
As when in heaven the stars about the moon
Look beautiful, when all the winds are laid,
And every height comes out and jutting peak
And valley, and the immeasurable heavens
Break open to their highest, and all the stars

Shine, and the Shepherd gladdens in his heart:
So many a fire between the ships and stream
Of Xanthus blazed before the towers of Troy,
A thousand on the plain; and close by each
Sat fifty in the blaze of burning fire;
And eating hoary grain and pulse the steeds
Fixt by their cars, waited the golden dawn.

Worsley is rather more prolix:

So they with high thoughts, on the bridge of
war
Sat through the night, their watchfires blazing
nigh.
As when the moon and every shining star
Beam loveliest, when the winds in slumber lie,
And in clear outline stand revealed thereby
Sharp peak, and sunken valley, and rifted hill:
Deep beyond deep unutterable the sky
Breaks open, and the night spreads calm and
still,
All the stars shine, and joy the shepherd's heart
doth fill.

Such in their multitudes from Xanthus stream,
Betwixt the rolling river and the main,
In front of Troy the Trojan watchfires gleam,
Which the men kindle and all night sustain.
A thousand fires were burning on the plain,
And beside each sat fifty, in the shine
Of burning fire; and champing the white grain
Of barley and spelt, the steeds in ordered line
Hard by their chariots stood, waiting the Dawn
divine.

It is interesting to see what this last stanza becomes in Pope's hands:

So many flames before proud Ilion blaze,
And brighten glimmering Xanthus with their
rays:
The long reflections of the distant fires
Gleam on the walls and tremble on the spires.
A thousand fires the dusky horrors gild,
And shoot a shady lustre o'er the field.
Full fifty guards each flaming pile attend,
Whose umbered arms, by fits, thick flashes
send;
Loud neigh the coursers o'er their heaps of
corn
And ardent warriors wait the rising morn.

Pope is indeed delightful and is full of really splendid passages, but, as Bentley says, 'you must not call it Homer.'

The Ballad metre Mr. Arnold easily disposes of as too jerky; and 'Homer is rapid in movement, plain in his words and style, simple in his ideas and noble in his manner,' which last is not expected of a ballad, also Chapman's long lines, in spite of what Keats, who knew no Greek, thought of them, he says simply 'tormented' Homer. So the conclusion he arrives at is that the

translator will have the best chance of preserving the general effect of Homer, if he makes use of the hexameter which will keep him more near than any other metre to Homer's movement; and to this conclusion he is partly impelled by the excellence of the following lines by Dr. Hawtrey, the accomplished Provost of Eton. The original is a famous passage in the Third Book of the *Iliad*, and the translation, Mr. Arnold says, seemed to him to produce in some degree, as no other English version had done, the original effect of Homer.

Helen is speaking to the aged Priam :
Clearly the rest I behold of the dark-eyed sons
of Achaia ;
Known to me well are the faces of all ; their
names I remember ;
Two, two only, remain, whom I see not among
the commanders,
Castor fleet in the car, Polydeukes brave with
the cestus,
Own dear brethren of mine, one parent lov'd us
as infants.
Are they not here in the host, from the shores
of lov'd Lacedemon,
Or, though they come with the rest in the ships
that bound thro' the waters,
Dare they not enter the fight or stand in the
council of heroes,
All for fear of the shame and the taunts my
crime has awakened ?
So said she ;—they long since in Earth's soft
arms were reposing
There, in their own dear land, their Fatherland
Lacedemon.

I think we should most of us agree that if we could have it all on this level we need ask for nothing better.

Mr. Arnold notes that he has changed Dr. Hawtrey's *Kastor* and *Lakedaimon* back to the familiar *Castor* and *Lacedemon*, in obedience to his own rule that everything *odd* is to be avoided in rendering Homer, and though a critic in a Review urges our generation to put up with the unnatural effect of those rewritten Greek names in the hope that by so doing the effect may, to the next generation, become natural, he characteristically adds: 'For my part, I feel no disposition to pass all my life in the wilderness of pedantry, in order that a posterity which I shall never see may one day enter an orthographical Canaan.'

It may be interesting here to exhibit a translation of the first lines of the *Iliad* both in hexameters and blank

verse by the same author, one well known for his great skill both in versification and in translation, Mr. C. S. Calverley.

We will take the blank verse first :

The wrath of Peleus' son, that evil wrath
Which on Achaia piled a myriad woes,
Oh, Goddess, sing : which down to darkness
hurled
Brave souls of mighty men, and made their
flesh
A prey to dogs and every ravening fowl.
Yet Zeus his will was working : since the day
When first 'twixt Atreus' son, the King of men,
And proud Achilles there arose up war.

And again

So spake he ; and the old man feared, and did
His bidding. Mute he moved along the shore,
Among the noises of the boisterous sea :
And there, apart from men, prayed many a
prayer
To gold-haired Leto's son, his King, Apollo.

* * * * *

So prayed he, and Apollo heard his prayer.
Yea from Olympus' heights he got him down
Wrath in his soul : upon his shoulder hung
The bow, and quiver covered all around.
Rang on the shoulder of the angry god
The arrows, as he stirred him : on he came
Like night : and by the ships he sate him down.
Twanged with a terrible twang the silver bow
As he sent forth one shaft.

And now to see the same passages in hexameters :

Sing, O daughter of heaven, of Peleus' son, of
Achilles,
Him whose terrible wrath brought thousand
woes on Achaia.
Many a stalwart soul did it hurl untimely to
Hades,
Souls of the heroes of old : and their bones lay
strewn on the sea-sands,
Prey to the vulture and dog. Yet was Zeus fulfilling a purpose ;
Since that far-off day, when in hot strife parted
asunder
Atreus' sceptred son, and the chos'n of heaven,
Achilles.

And,

These were the words of the king, and the old
man feared and obeyed him :
Voiceless he went by the shore of the great dull-
echoing ocean,
Thither he gat him apart, that ancient man ;
and a long prayer
Prayed to Apollo his Lord, son of golden-
ringleted Leto :

* * * * *

So did he pray, and his prayer reached the ears
of Phœbus Apollo.
Dark was the soul of the god as he moved from
the heights of Olympus,
Shouldering a bow, and a quiver on this side
fast and on that side.

Onward in anger he moved. And the arrows,
stirred by the motion,
Rattled and rang on his shoulder: he came as
cometh the midnight.
Hard by the ships he stayed him, and loosed
one shaft from the bow-string;

Here I think most people will admit
that the hexameter gives the movement
and original effect of Homer better than
the blank verse.

But when it comes to reproducing
the list of ships in Book II., then the
blank verse is certainly better than any
other metre, and the magnificent sound
of the Greek names reminds one of the
constant delight Milton had in rolling
them off, *e.g.* :

From Anachosia, and Candaor East,
And Margiana, to the Hyrcanian cliffs
Of Caucasus, and dark Iberian dales :
From Atropatia and the neighbouring plains
Of Aiabene, Media, and the South
Of Susiana, to Balsara's haven.

Par. Reg. III. 316.

Mr. Calverley's list of ships will be
found to be quite in that style:

Mycenae or Cleonae, well-walled towns,
Or sumptuous Corinth, Araithyria sweet,
Orneia, or where first Adrastus reigned,
Sicyon ; who dwelt on Gonoessa's steep,
Or Hyperesia ; by Pellene dwelt
And Aegius, and all along the coast,
And round broad Helice : their hundred ships
Were led by Agamemnon, Atreus' son.

* * * * *
And those who tilled Laconia's rugged dales,
Pharis or Sparta, or the haunt of doves
Messe ; Amyclae, Helos' sea-washed walls,
Laiis or Oetylus : Menelaüs led,

* * * * *
And those from Pylos, from Arenè fair,
Thrios, the ford of Alpheus, Aepy's walls,
Cyparisseis, Helos, Pteleon,
Amphigeneia, Dorion :—where the Nine
Fell in with Thracian-Thamyris, on his road
From Thessaly, the home of Eurytus,
And silenced all his songs : because he stood
Their vaunted conqueror, would they but
appear—

Those Muses, sprung of Aegis-armed Zeus—
And sing against him : they, thereat enraged,
Smote him with blindness, took away that gift
Divine, that he forgot his minstrelsy :—

There is a particular charm about
the last eight lines, but the list of names
would be heavy in the long hexameter
metre. Mr. Calverley's hexameters
have also a special charm when he is
translating Lucretius, Book II. :

Sweet, when the great sea's water is stirred to
his depths by the storm-winds,
Standing ashore to descry one afar-off mightily
struggling :

Not that a neighbour's sorrow to you yields
dulcet enjoyment ;
But that the sight hath a sweetness, of ills our-
selves are exempt from.

And again,

Still Universal Nature abides unchanged as
aforetime.

Whereof this is the cause. When the atoms
part from a substance,
That suffers loss ; but another is elsewhere
gaining an increase :

So that, as one thing wanes, still a second bursts
into blossom,

Soon, in its' turn, to be left. Thus draws this
Universe always

Gain out of loss ; thus live we mortals one on
another.

Bourgeons one generation, and one fades. Let
but a few years

Pass, and a race has arisen which was not : as
in a racecourse,

One hands on to another the burning torch of
Existence.

Charles Kingsley, in his *Andromeda*,
has used the hexameter with accuracy
and with a scholar's fine ear for metre.
The following will serve as a specimen :

Bright white mists rose slowly ; beneath, the
wandering ocean

Glimmered and glowed to the deepest abyss
and the knees of the maiden

Trembled and sank in her fear, as afar, like a
dawn in the midnight,

Rose from the seaweed chamber the choir of
the mystical sea-maids.

Onward toward her they came, and her heart
beat loud at their coming.

Watching the bliss of the gods, as they
wakened the cliffs with their laughter.

Later the description of the storm on
the coast is singularly fine, and so is
that of the sea-eagle :

As when an osprey aloft dark eyebrowed
royally crested

Falls from the sky like a star, while the wind
rattles hoarse in his pinions.

Over him closes the foam for a moment, then
from the sand-bed,

Rolls up the great fish dead, and his side gleams
white in the sunshine.

Of all these writers I should be in-
clined to take Calverley as a model. He
never writes a line which will not 'read
itself.' He ends all his lines as a
matter of course with a proper dactyl
and spondee, and he invariably begins
with an unmistakeable long syllable.
This is where Mr. Arnold himself, in
the specimens which he felt bound to
offer of his own translation into hexa-
meters, so often lets us down. He
begins almost every sixth line with a

short syllable, 'For the day will come,' 'In the bloody dust,' 'of the horsemen of Troy,' 'and not leave him behind.' 'To lie low in death.' At the same time by reading these lines naturally you can, though not without a certain sense of discomfort at these initial short syllables, read all his lines as hexameters and get the right rhythm. They are not too dactylic like *Evangeline*, and he does not often lengthen short syllables or *vice versa*; for though one line does end with 'and sees thy tears falling,' if a pause is made after tears, the irregularity of metre rather tends to heighten the effect, but nothing can make 'sees thy tears' a good dactyl.

Mr. Arnold's aim has been, he tells us, to make his translations even plainer and more unambiguous than Homer himself, and he is conscious that in aiming at this, he has not attained to the 'the ease and sweetness' of Homer, nor, we may add, has he equalled the music and grandeur of Homer. But who has? The other writers of really good hexameters are few, the best being Clough and the present Lord Tennyson. Clough's *Amours de Voyage* and his *Bothie* are both of a serio-comic nature, but he wields the metre with skill and writes both hexameters and elegiacs. His verse is certainly rapid in movement and musical, though 'rough and irregular' at times; but he uses spondees freely, for which Mr. Arnold commends him, and the reader, even though not a classical scholar, gets the right rhythm without difficulty. Here is a specimen from his *Amours de Voyage*:

Tibur is beautiful, too, and the orchard slopes
and the Anio
Falling, falling yet, to the ancient lyrical
cadence;
Tibur and Anio's tide; and cool from Lucretius
ever,
With the Digentian stream and with the Bandusian
Fountain,
Folded in Sabine recesses, the valley and Villa
of Horace.

Here the only exception to be taken is at the disregard for the quantity in Bandusian. He might have written 'and with Bandusia's fountain.' Still, the shortening of the first syllable does not prevent this line 'reading itself.'

Take another passage:

Juxtaposition is great,—but you tell me affinity greater.

Ah, my friend, there are many affinities, greater and lesser,

Stronger and weaker; and each, by the favour of juxtaposition,

Potent, efficient in force,—for a time; but none, let me tell you

Save by the law of the land and the ruinous force of the will, oh

None, I fear me, at last quite sure to be final and perfect.

The last author of really good hexameters whom I shall quote is the present Lord Tennyson. His verses were first brought to my notice by the poet himself. We had been talking about translating Homer. Tennyson thought that no metre could equal the hexameter in Virgil's hands. Witness his sonorous lines:

I salute thee, Mantovano, I that loved thee
since my day began,
Wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded
by the lips of man.

But he did not admire its use in English, and thought blank verse the proper metre to be used in translating Homer; and certainly his specimen quoted above goes far to convince one that he was right. He thought to translate Homer was almost the task of a lifetime, and that, when done, the benefit would abide with the translator; also he agreed that to make good blank verse was not given to everybody, but, he said, 'there is no difficulty about hexameters.'

Aldworth that stands on the hill o'erlooking the
woods and the champaign,

he rolled this out, and two and three more, and said: 'I could go on for ever like that, but what is the good? But have you seen Hallam's hexameters of *Jack and the Beanstalk*? Read them, they are really good.' Let us take a specimen describing the Giant and his wife:

Ladle in hand she stood, and spake in a tone of
amusement,

'Oh! what a cramp'd up small unsequipedalian
object!'

Then from afar came steps heavy tramps as a
pavior hamm'ring;

Out of her huge moon cheeks the redundant
peony faded,

Jack's lank hair she grabbed, and, looking sad
resolution,

Pop't him aghast in among her saucepans'
grimy recesses.

Then strode in with a loud heavy-booted
thunder of heeltaps,
He with a tiger at heel, her giant, swarthy,
colossal.

The story and Caldecott's illustrations are alike delightful, and the whole is a very satisfactory exercise in hexameters. A happy use of spondees serves now and then to emphasise the action. For instance:

Down he crooked his monstrous knees and
rested his hipbones.

Or,

Sprang down pod by pod, with a bounding
grasshopper action.

From all the above quotations it is clear that the hexameter is excellent for narrative, and in spite of the length of its line is lighter in some ways and more rapid than blank verse; while, for a classically educated person who has an ear, the metre should present no difficulty. We are accustomed to think of Coleridge as a consummate master of metre and rhythm. He wrote few hexameters, but of course he wrote them correctly. A letter of his, written from Göttingen in 1799 to Wordsworth and his sister at Goslar, begins:

William, my teacher, my friend! dear William
and dear Dorothea!

William, my head and my heart, dear poet that
feelest and thinkest!

Dorothy, eager of soul, my most affectionate
sister!

Many a mile, O! many a wearisome mile are ye
distant,

Long long comfortless roads, with no one eye
that doth know us.

And it ends with:

William, my head and my heart! dear William
and dear Dorothea!

You have all in each other; but I am lonely,
and want you!

Before I make any quotations from the classical metres exhibited by Mr. R. Bridges, let me premise that it is not given to every one to be able to distinguish the difference between accent and quantity.

We are told that accent is to syllables what emphasis is to words, the use of either being to distinguish or make the syllable or word more conspicuous.

By quantity we mean the relative length of a syllable, and Lindley Murray used to tell us that the quantity of syllables is fixed in words separately

pronounced, but mutable when words are arranged in sentences. This only applies to English, for in Latin, with certain definite and intelligible exceptions, a vowel before two consonants is always long, but in English three or even four consonants do not necessarily lengthen a vowel. From this it is plain that English verse does not depend on quantity, but has a variety and elasticity unknown to the classics. Not that quantity is to be ignored altogether, and although some writers on English rhythm have held that accent is the sole principle that regulates English verse, the poets usually contrive to make accent and quantity in English verse go together.

Coleridge, in his preface to *Christabel*, says that the metre is founded on a new principle—namely, that of counting in each line the accents, not the syllables; and though the latter may vary from seven to twelve, yet in each line the accents will be found to be only four. Certainly he carried out his principle with success.

The usual pronunciation indicates pretty clearly which syllables are long and which short; but no rule is without its exception, and, to prevent monotony, the lengthening of a short syllable is sometimes welcome. But the shortening of long syllables and the disregard of the ordinary and usual pronunciation of syllables, in the way practised by the latest school of metrists, does such violence to the ear that it is impossible to regard it as any more likely to become permanent than the hideous vagaries of the Impressionist and Cubist sects in Art.

Mr. Bridges, in his *Poems in Classical Prosody*, has made experiments in 'quantitative verse' in fulfilment of a promise to the late Mr. W. J. Stone, that he would some day test his theory. He tells us in his preface that he gradually emancipated himself from Stone's rules, but he says that he has now come to approve of the quantities used in his Latin experiments, such as in his 'line for line paraphrase of Virgil.' Personally I like his *Epistle to L.M.* a good deal better than his paraphrase, and it is very interesting to hear in his prefatory remarks that, though the

difficulty of adopting our English syllables to the Greek rules is very great, and even deterrent, yet that the experiments he has made reveal a vast unexplored field of delicate and expressive rhythms hitherto unknown in our poetry, and that this has amply rewarded him for his friendly undertaking. I must admit a deplorable ignorance of these unsuspected rhythms, but I know that to 99 per cent. of the lovers of English poetry, the new method, as shown in the lines I am about to quote, will not be any more pleasing than it is to me. It is in speaking of lines of the following kind that Mr. Arnold says: 'not only is the reader causelessly required to make havoc with the natural accentuation of the line in order to get it to run as an hexameter, but also, in nine cases out of ten, he will be utterly at a loss how to perform the process required, and the line will remain a mere monster to him.' He also lays it down that whereas 'it is advisable to construct *all* verses, so that by reading them naturally—that is, according to the sense and legitimate accent—the reader gets the right rhythm; for English hexameters, that they be so constructed is indispensable.' His other rules are that what is by the ordinary method of English pronunciation usually long, must be kept long, and what is short not lengthened, and always the natural accentuation made use of.

We all know that of the six feet of an hexameter the first four may be either dactyls (— — —) or spondees (— —), but that the fifth foot must be a dactyl and the sixth a spondee or a trochee (— —); in other words, that the final syllable of the line may be either long or short. These rules Mr. Bridges in his quantitative verse finds himself able to disregard, and using an iambic (— —) instead of a trochee (— —) he frequently makes the *first* syllable of the final foot short instead of the *last* syllable, so that the line cannot be used as an hexameter except by disregarding all natural accentuation. *E.g.*: 'But the sullen boatman took now one now other *at will*'; again he ends a line with 'peacefully entombed.' 'On the second morn,' 'already was saved,' where the accent of *already* has to be removed from the

second to the first syllable and a false stress laid on *was*. Even worse instances are: 'Through the upper seams,' 'unblossoming buds,' 'cruelly consumed,' 'old feminine form,' 'her delicate horn,' 'mighty brothers stood,' 'last terrible night,' 'Confederate Greeks,' 'Fortress of Dis,' 'Hastily was fled,' 'deadly dreaded bolt,' 'brandishing on high,' 'rend'ring heavy payment,' 'turn the forest glade,' 'ritual exact,' 'her bloody bare neck,' 'all the meadow hums'—all these terminations and more are found in 'a line for line paraphrase' of a passage from Virgil, *Aeneid* VI., and none of them when read with the legitimate accent will make the required dactyl and spondee or trochee.

There are other harsh and impossible lines which it is very difficult to consider hexameters at all; for instance, who would find the stately Virgilian line in the following?

'Are the buried; nor ever any mortal across the
livid lake.'
'Grieving in heart and much pitying their un-
merited lot.'
'Safe would arrive. Where now his truth? Is
this the promised faith?'
'Wind borne and on the current far-drifting, an'
on the second morn.'
'Creak'd, and a brown water came trickling
through the upper seams.'
'Fearfully in once loved accents he lovingly
address her.'
'Red Phlegethon, and huge boulders his soundy
bubbles be.'
'Thence the living creatures, man, brute, and
and every feathered fowl.'
'With penalties many as their guilt; some
purify exposed.'

Two more only I will quote, as, after trying to scan them, they remain 'mere monsters' to me:

In playful combat since wrestling upon the
yellow sand.

And,

By fragrant laurel o'ercanopied when 'twixt
enamel'd banks.

This, I take it, is quantitative verse after Mr. Stone's new method. I say nothing of the absence of all Virgil's poetic beauty and pathos, for it is only the metre I am dealing with. But I pass on to the *Epistle to L.M.*, which has been selected for a little volume called *Poets and Poetry of the Twentieth Century*.

Here I find a more fearful 'monster' than ever. Speaking of unwinding the inside of an old fives-ball, we have this truly marvellous line:

Untwining the ravel'd worsted; that mere rubbish and waste.

To make this scan, I suppose we must put an accent on the last syllable of *ravel'd* and *worsted*, make the first syllable of *rubbish* short, and make *and* a long syllable.

Other lines in this letter are:

We may joyfully despising the pedantries of old age.

And,

Tho' I lack the Wizard Darwin's scientific insight.

Or again,

By trimming our old canvas in all change of weather and wind.

Let any one read these quoted lines naturally, according to sense and legitimate accent and see if he could pass any of them, if shown up in a schoolboy's exercise, as hexameters.

In a translation from Homer, *Iliad* XXIV. 468-551, Mr. Bridges again tries the hexameter, and we agree that Homer suits him better than Virgil; but the same disregard for the usual and legitimate accent is, of course, exhibited, and a new device is introduced by altering the spelling of a word. Thus Achilles is twice over spelt with one 'l,' in order that the second syllable may be used short. In another place 'little' is spelt 'litel' that the second syllable may be used long, but this is mere juggling. Here are a few of these quantitative hexameters:

In wide Troy where be they now? scarce is one of them left.

The emphasis here in this string of monosyllables comes on *is* and *them*, and in the next line on *and*:

But he who was alone the city's loved guardian and stay.

Then we have the endings, 'so many and good,' 'fierce battle and blood,' and many lines which none of those whose hexameters I have given above would dream of regarding as an hexameter, and certainly they were capable scholars

and knew their metre—and their lines run easily and musically, and are a pleasure to read—but then they are built on the Old Classical model, to which I trust after these bold experiments in the New Method by the Poet Laureate, future writers will see fit to revert.

We can see that the question of quantities in English verse is difficult and interesting, but it can hardly be considered either necessary or practical to try and force it upon the English poetry reader, who naturally looks to poetry to give pleasure to the ear, by its melody and ease in reading; and when this is so readily obtainable, the difficult and the harsh can surely stand little or no chance of being adopted.

Mr. Bridges, we are constantly being told, is a master of rhythm, and he has evidently taken great pains loyally to carry out his promise to his departed friend; but from the result it must be clear to all that Mr. Stone's method can never take root in our soil, or be successfully transplanted into English verse, where what makes the verse agreeable is rhythm and melody, the very things which the metres of quantitative verse seem to take so little account of.

For myself, in spite of much learned writing about 'centroids,' and 'mono-pressures,' and 'intensive co-ordination,' and 'phonetic syzygy' (a phrase which means less than its wire-entanglement appearance would seem to indicate), I am glad to agree with Professor Saintsbury when he says: 'In English, by the grace of God and the Muses, the poetry makes the rules and not the rules the poetry.' The only rule I contend for is that English verse must be governed by the ordinary laws of English speech.

The Elegiac metre is not very frequently attempted in English.

Coleridge's pretty couplet translated from Schiller,

In the hexameter rises the fountain's silvery column,

In the pentameter aye falling in melody back.

was called by Tennyson 'shocking.' He would not hear of the first syllable of 'pentameter' being shortened or that of melody lengthened. But the ear of

the ordinary person is not afflicted by either of these things. There are a number of words which we can pronounce long or short indifferently, just as we habitually put the stress on either syllable of the word '*Princess*.' The paucity of specimens in our language shows that the elegiac couplet does not suit itself to English poetry; perhaps Clough's are the best. But Mr. Bridges has three in his *Spirit of Man* which are all spoilt by the same disregard of the legitimate accent. Ovid's rule is that the last half of a pentameter should consist of two dactyls and a long syllable, and that no word of more than two syllables should come at the end. Judged by these two simple rules none of these three little pieces can be considered faultless.

This is one of them :

At dead of unseen night ghosts of the departed
assembling,
Flit to the graves, where each in body had
burial.
Ah, then revisiting my sad heart, their desolate
tomb
Troop the desires and loves vainly buried long
ago.

Here the second *of* and *in* are made long and the accent is removed from the first syllable of *burial* and *buried* and placed on the last, and a heavy accent placed on the last syllable of *desolate*.

Another pretty little quatrain is spoilt by the pentameters. If we read them with the ordinary accent on each word, they cease even to simulate pentameters; e.g.

And the mellow flutings of passionate Philomel.

Another four lines, 'from the Greek,' has for its final pentameter—

And my lively spirit drinketh immortality.
Who could possibly guess this to be a
pentameter?

If ever a syllable was indubitably long, it is this first syllable of *immortality*, how else would anyone ever read.

'When this mortal shall have put on immortality?' But here it is made short.

Clough is not particularly good in all his elegiac attempts, but they are easy to read, which is a certain test of excellence, and the words have their usual accents. The following are from the *Amours de Voyage*.

Eastward, or Northward, or West? I wander
and ask as I wander,
Weary, yet eager and sure, where shall I come
to my love?
Whitherward hasten to seek her? ye daughters
of Italy tell me,
Graceful and tender and dark, is she consort-
ing with you?
Thou that outclimbest the torrent, that tendest
thy goats to the summit,
Call to me, child of the Alps, has she been
seen in the heights?
Italy farewell I bid thee, for whither she leads
me I follow.
Farewell the vineyard! for I, where I but
guess her, must go,
Weariness welcome, and labour, wherever it be,
if at last it
Bring me on mountain or plain into the sigh
of my love.

Of the Horatian metres we need only glance at two, the Sapphic and the Alcaic, and here we may note that Tennyson thought that the Horatian Sapphic was not at all equal to that of Sappho, but that his Alcaics were even better than any made by Alcaeus.

I suppose the best-known specimen of the English Sapphic is 'The Friend of Humanity and The Needy Knife-grinder,' published in the *Anti-Jacobin* in 1797:

FRIEND OF HUMANITY.

Needy knife-grinder! whither are you going?
Rough is the road, your wheel is out of order—
Bleak blows the blast;—your hat has got a
hole in't,
So have your breeches!

* * * * *

Tell me, knife-grinder, how you came to grind
knives.

Did some rich man tyrannically use you?
Was it the Squire? or parson of the parish?
Or the attorney?

* * * * *

Have you not read the Rights of Man by Tom
Paine?

Drops of compassion tremble on my eyelids
Ready to fall, as soon as you have told your
Pitiful story.

KNIFE-GRINDER.

Story! God bless you! I have none to tell, sir,
Only last night a-drinking at the chequers
This poor old hat and breeches, as you see, got
Torn in a scuffle.

* * * * *

I should be glad to drink your Honour's
health in

A pot of beer, if you will give me six pence,
But for my part I never love to meddle
With politics, sir.

FRIEND OF HUMANITY.

I give thee six pence! I will see thee damn'd first—

Wretch, whom no sense of wrongs can rouse to vengeance!

Sordid, unfeeling, reprobate, degraded,
Spiritless outcast!

(Kicks the knife-grinder, overturns his wheel, and exults in a transport of Republican enthusiasm and Universal Philanthropy.)

It is not easy to consider *wrongs* in the last stanza a short syllable, and there is a tendency all through the poem to make that syllable long after the break in each of the long lines, though in Horace it is short, the metre being this, with a break in the middle of the lines, the end of the fifth foot almost always being the end of a word.

— u — / — — // u u — / u — u
— u u / — u

E.g.,

Jam satis terris nivis atque dirae
Grandinis misit Pater, ac rubente
Dextera sacras jaculatus arces
Terruit urbem.

Or again,

Tibur Argaeo positum colono
Sit meae sedes utinam senectae,
Sit modus lasso maris et viarum
Militiaeque.

Mr. Bridges is one of the few who have written English Sapphics. Here is the first of three stanzas called *Povre Ame Amoureuse* from Louise Labe 1555:

When to my lone soft bed at eve returning
Sweet desired sleep already stealeth o'er me,
My spirit flieth to the fairyland of
Her tyrannous love.

But though much better than the preceding poem called *Evening*, this pretty little lyric stanza is spoilt as a Sapphic by the word *tyrannous* which is commonly used by us as a dactyl but which Mr. Bridges turns into an anapaest. The Sapphic metre is essentially classic, and we may rest assured that it will never take its place as an English Lyric metre in common use. Horace's Sapphics are very delightful and will always be so to those who know the language.

Shortly before the war the *Westminster Gazette* offered a prize for an English poem in Sapphics.

Some extraordinary metres were sent in. In one rather pretty poem the

NO. CCLXIV. VOL. XXXI.

second foot of the long lines was simply omitted in many instances:

*Stillness, darkness weigh on us unwilling
See there westwards to a shining planet.*

The Prize Poem took little or no notice of the break which Horace carefully observes after the first five feet and so we find monsters in it like this:

Faint with unassuageable agelong anguish
Lilith's voice but sadder than grief, but broken.
Pierced with eyes that hated her, eyes that followed.

I thought at the time that it was a pity to give a prize to that kind of thing. I don't know about Sappho, but certainly Horace would never have recognised it for the Sapphic metre, and I suppose it was the Horatian stanza that was aimed at.

We need only speak of one more of Horace's metres, the Alcaic. This is a really grand metre, and though not much used in English, the experiment which Tennyson gave us is undoubtedly very fine. There is a grand rhythm and roll about it, and as handled by him it suits itself to its subject:

O mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies,
O skill'd to sing of Time or Eternity,
Godgifted organ voice of England,
Milton, a name to resound for ages;
Whose Titan angels, Gabriel, Abdiel,
Starr'd from Jehovah's gorgeous armouries,
Tower as the deep-domed Empyrean
Rings to the roar of an angel onset.

It seems to me that a good many people can read that with pleasure, even if they do not know the metre, because of the grandeur of the words. But unless there is this grandeur, these Horatian metres will not commend themselves to the unclassical as poetry at all.

Hester Brayne, writing to the *Poetry Review* just before the war, says that for ears accustomed to the music of English poetry, the pretty little Alcaics, No. 194, in Mr. Bridges' *Spirit of Man*, have no verse-rhythm whatever; and her case is that of the public generally.

Even in this Mr. Bridges is not without his usual false quantity. I confess I cannot understand this. I can only suppose it comes of studying quantitative verse, but after the fine line,

All Holy Morn in *splendour* awakening,

F

how he can write with any feeling of satisfaction,

With music endeth night's *prisoning terror*,
as though it could be read in a similar way, is, to ordinary ears, more than strange. All classical scholars know that the penultimate foot in the first two lines of an Alcaic stanza must be short and preceded by a long syllable. But what becomes of this rule? In such lines as the one just quoted, or in the line from the Peace Ode,

Till from the coil of slow gathering battle,
another line ends with 'implacable folly,' and similarly further on we have a line ending with '*in diligent passage*.' These may be the 'delicate and expressive rhythms hitherto unknown in our poetry,' but can we recognise them? and are they not a pain rather than a pleasure to us ordinary lovers of verse?

Again we have the ending of '*Caledonia*,' where 'of' is made a long syllable, and this is followed by one good and one terrible line:

With Cambria's half-Celtic offspring,
And the ever merry fighting Irish.

Which, to be scanned as the last line of an Alcaic stanza, would have to be pronounced 'and the *e-vermery* fighting Irish.'

The last two stanzas of the ode are unmistakably fine, though I don't quite understand the meaning of 'Celestial excellences,' and have to put up with the ever-recurring false quantity in the words '*friendliness and commerce*,' which we have to force into a pronunciation quite foreign to their nature.

After reading this ode, with what relief do we turn to Horace:

Atqui sciebat quae sibi barbarus
Tortor pararet: non aliter tamen
Dimovit obstantes propinquos,
Et populum redivis morantem.

Quam si clientum longa negotia
Dijudicata lite relinqueret,
Tendens Venafranum in agros,
Aut Lacedaemonium Tarentum.

These lines on Regulus are so splendid and such a delight to read, that one is constantly tempted to reproduce the metre in English: but I fear it is impossible to naturalise it or make it more than just a pleasant exercise for the

amusement of scholars. The hexameter may be said to have more or less 'caught on' in English, but no one can say this of Elegiacs or Latin Lyrics.

Since writing the above I see in the September number of the *Poetry Review* that the editor has introduced to the notice of his readers two specimens of English Elegiac verse, one by C. W. Brodribb in the 'quantitative' or impossible style, on Spring, the last line ends with 'thy blessing and providence,' and one by a gallant young officer who has given his life for his country, who was a scholar of his College and had a pretty gift for English verse. He (Captain A. G. Cowie, of the Seaforth Highlanders) saw beauty even in the dreary flats by the banks of the Tigris, and put his thoughts into these excellent Elegiacs:

Here, in the dim grey dawn, 'neath the rushing
of myriad seawolf
Hurling in shadowy ranks out of the breast
of the deep:
Here, when the curlew's cry wails out o'er the
desolate mud-flats
Mingled with clamorous gulls, calling each
other from sleep.

There is a melody in that which I try in vain to find in the 'quantitative elegiacs.' For in them we have, though the hexameters are right enough, nearly all the pentameters ending with a word of more than two syllables—a thing never to be tolerated in classical schools nor ever sanctioned by Ovid—and many of these endings absolutely defying the ordinary mode of their English pronunciation: *e.g.*, 'trees, bushes, and coppices,' 'friable unto tillage,' 'life's prisoning manacles,' 'murderous and primitive,' 'so devilishly crooked,' 'thy blessing and providence.' These same false accents we have seen in passages quoted above. I don't know why, but they seem to be inseparable from quantitative experiments. But that such tricks should be played with the English language and its recognised pronunciation, even when done by poets, does not make it less unnatural or less unmelodious. The hexameter and pentameter are classical, and, though used with English words, they should keep to their classical rules; and how

any writer can presume to palm off upon the readers of the *Poetry Review* such a pentameter as 'Whatsoever mercies, whatsoever charities' entirely passes my comprehension.

The abandoning of the Ovidian rule that no word to end a pentameter may have more than two syllables causes at once a loss of melody. For there is melody in Ovid's Elegiacs. Let me instance this by quoting for my conclusion a passage, also about spring, which stirred the Latin poet in much the same way as it stirs Mr. Brodribb:

Dic, age frigoribus quare novus incipit annus,
Qui melius per ver incipiendus erat?
Omnia tunc florent, tunc est nova temporis aetas,
Et nova de gravido palmite gemma tumet:

Et modo formatis operitur frondibus arbor,
Prodit et in summum seminis herba solum:
Et tepidum volucres concentibus aëra mulcent,
Ludit et in pratis luxuriatque pecus.
Tum blandi soles, ignotaque prodit hirundo
Et luteum celsa sub trabe figit opus:
Tum patitur cultus ager et renovatur aratro:
Haec anni novitas jure vocanda fuit.

OXONIENSIS.

P.S.—The attempt to use classical metres in English verse seems to be growing. In the November number of the *Poetry Review* an American lady, Dr. Marion Mills, is quoted with approval for her English Sapphics, in which five lines out of sixteen have either a foot too few or one too many.

ON THE PROSPECTIVE USE OF THE LATIN IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE IN RELATIVE CLAUSES.

THE object of this note is to call attention to a peculiar use of the Latin imperfect subjunctive in relative clauses, which, though recognised by implication in various stray renderings, has not hitherto, so far as I am aware, been established on a proper grammatical footing by a coordination and comparison of relevant instances. A list of these, capable, no doubt, of considerable extension, will first be given, and an attempt will then be made to discover some common principle of explanation:

1. Medea illa . . . quam praedicant in fuga fratris sui membra in eis locis, *quae* se parens *persequeretur*, dissipavisse, ut eorum conlectio dispersa maerorque patrius celeritatem persequendi retardaret.—Cic. *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 9 § 22.

2. Nec vero eram tam indoctus ignarusque rerum, ut frangerer animo propter vitae cupiditatem, *quae* me manens *conficeret* angoribus, dimissa molestiis omnibus *liberaret*.—Cic. *Phil.* II. 15 § 37.

3. (Antony fleeing before Octavianus and his army) neglectis sacrificiis sollemnibus ante lucem vota ea, *quae* numquam *solveret*, nuncupavit.—*Ib.* III. 4 § 11.

4. Id cum Oppianicus sciret—neque enim erat obscurum—intellegebat Habito mortuo bona eius omnia ad matrem esse ventura: *quae* ab sese postea aucta pecunia maiore praemio, orbata filio minore periculo *necaretur*.—Cic. *pro Clu.* 15 § 45.

5. Alter plus lege agendo petebat, quam quantum lex in XII. tabulis permiserat, *quod*

cum impetrasset, causa *caderet*.—Cic. *de Or.* i. § 167.

6. Qui egregie cordatus et catus fuit et ab Ennio dictus est, non quod ea quaerebat *quae* numquam *inveniret*, sed quod ea respondebat, *quae* eos qui quaesissent, et cura et negotio *solverent*.—Cic. *de Rep.* I. 18, p. 285.

7. Et supererat multitudo . . . ad id pastores quoque accesserant, qui omnes facile spem facerent parvam Albam, parvum Lavinium, prae ea urbe, *quae* *conderetur*, fore.—Liv. I. 6. 3.

8. . . . Tullia per patris corpus carpentum egisse fertur, partemque sanguinis . . . tulisse ad penates suos virique sui, *quibus* iratis malo regni principio similes prope diem exitus *sequebantur*.—*Id.* I. 48. 7.

9. (Of two proposals for disposing of the spoil of Veii) Haec tutior visa sententia est, *quae* popularem senatum *faceret*.—*Id.* V. 20. 10.

10. In praesentia tribunos plebis fieri placuit, *quo* in magistratu sibimet ipsi viam ad ceteros honores *aperirent*.—*Id.* VI. 35. 3.

11. Se quisque eum optabat, *quem* fortuna in id certamen *legeret*.—*Id.* XXI. 42. 2.

12. (News of Agricola's death awaited by Domitian) Supremo quidem die momenta ipsa deficientis per dispositos cursores nuntiata constabat, nullo credente sic *adcelerari quae* tristic *audiret*.—Tac. *Agr.* 43. 3.

Now what is common to most, if not all, these instances (some, as will be explained, are included only tentatively) is that in the clauses indicated by italics the imperfect subjunctive refers to the future from the past: it is 'prospective' or 'anticipatory,' and expresses the various shades of meaning—'what was

to be,' 'was likely, or intended, to be,' and the like—which are usually expressed by forms in *-urus* with past tenses of *sum*, or by a *feri posset* where the verb is passive. It is not contended that these latter constructions would not be the normal ones in such cases, but that the imperfect subjunctive is allowed to stand for them as a shorter substitute. Further to define this special use, we must consider its relation to various others in the way of affinity or distinction. (a) Is it necessarily connected with *oratio obliqua*? It is so connected, actually or virtually, in the large majority of the instances: but this does not apply to No. 5, and applies very doubtfully to Nos. 3 and 6, all of which resemble the rest too closely to be excluded from our survey. Hence we must conclude that, whether or not indirect speech was a contributory cause in giving rise to this construction, this form of subordination is not a necessary condition of its use in actual practice. (b) The use in question is not to be identified with any of the more ordinary uses of the subjunctive in relative clauses expressive of purpose, class within which, definition, or cause. These are, indeed, sometimes prospective—always so where purpose is concerned. But this is the only point of connection: for in our instances the relative clauses are purely attributive (sometimes, as in No. 4, co-ordinative), and express contingent futurity without any of those added meanings. At least this holds good of all the more marked cases, though there are some in which it is difficult to say whether purpose is expressed or not. Thus in No. 10, which is quoted merely to illustrate this doubtful point, it is possible to see either purpose ('in which office it was intended they should open up for themselves,' etc.) or an anticipated event ('in which they would,' etc.) No great stress need be laid on such instances: but the suggestion may be thrown out that, whereas the subjunctive in relative clauses of purpose is in general to be accounted for as an 'indirect jussive,' a collateral source may have been the subjunctive of contingent futurity which is here under consideration. 'What would, or was likely to happen,' easily

passes into 'what was intended to happen.' This would apply, of course, wherever the relative clause describes a result which the agent both anticipates and desires. But a little consideration will show that in all the other instances but that mentioned such a notion is excluded either by the meaning or the structure of the sentence. (c) We must, then, fall back on the hypothetical subjunctive. In several of the instances an equivalent of a protasis is supplied by the context: as in Nos. 2, 4 and 8 by the participles, in No. 5 by the *cum*-clause. In the others we should have the potential subjunctive. But the tense cannot be reconciled with the accepted rules governing conditional sentences. For according to these the imperfect subjunctive refers either to present or past time, never to future time either from the present or the past. Hence we must recognise that this is a special use, confined to relative clauses, which may have been evolved under the influence partly of *oratio obliqua*, with which it is so often connected, partly of the types of relational subjunctive dealt with under the last section, though it is, as explained, distinct from them.¹

Having now approximately fixed the

¹ As the term 'prospective' was first introduced by Prof. Sonnenschein, I should like to bring the purport of this note into some relation with his views, and especially with his valuable treatment of the subjunctive mood in his *New Latin Grammar* (1914). I fail for two reasons to find there an adequate account of the particular construction under discussion. (1) The prospective subjunctive is confined to certain temporal clauses (§§ 339-41). (2) The uses of the subjunctive are divided under three heads according as it denotes (a) what is to be done (the *shall*-subjunctive), (b) what would happen under certain imagined conditions (the subjunctive of conditional futurity), or (c) has a weakened meaning, which does not here concern us. Such instances as he calls 'prospective' fall entirely under (a)—though it is true he suggests that (a) and (b) may have had a common original source (p. 162 footnote). Now it is beyond the scope of this note to go into the question of the original meaning of the subjunctive. I should be satisfied, provisionally at any rate, with the account given of the Greek subjunctive in Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 274, that it 'may be said in general to express either the *will* of the speaker or his sense of the *necessity* of a future event.' But in any case I assume that in classical Latin the subjunctive had acquired several derivative or differentiated

boundaries of our construction, I proceed to examine some of the instances more closely, together with the comments offered upon them. The perplexities which will thus be brought to light will, perhaps, furnish some excuse for the lengthiness of the preceding discussion.

In No. 1 King explains the relevant clause by 'in which her father was likely to follow her,' adding 'the subjunctive would have been used even had the sentence been in the *oratio recta*, as marking the motive with which the spots had been chosen by Medea.' This is not very clearly put. Even if we removed the main *oratio obliqua* (*quam praedicant*, etc.) the clause in question, so far as it continued to mark the motive (more properly 'conditions under which the motive operates'—for the motive proper is given by the *ut*-clause), would still be in *virtual oratio obliqua*, as expressing Medea's not Cicero's thoughts. It often happens that there is, or may be, an inner *virtual oratio obliqua* besides the main *oratio obliqua*: this applies notably to No. 12. Yet in view of No. 5 and some others, one cannot deny, as already said, that the subjunctive might apparently stand even in pure *oratio recta*. But then we should surely have to change *se* into *eam*.

The same kind of question arises on No. 3, which is difficult. "'Which he was never doomed to pay"; i.e. Cicero expresses his belief that Antony's prayers would not be granted, and that so he would not be obliged to pay his vows' (King). This is probably right, and in that case we have pure *oratio recta*. But two other possibilities may be considered: (1) *Virtual oratio obliqua*, 'which he thought he would never have to pay;' (2) final subjunctive 'with no intention of ever paying them.' The latter is improbable: the use of *ea* is against it, and in a rhetorical sense it seems to overshoot the mark.

In Nos. 7, 9 it is possible to avoid the prospective sense by taking *conderetur*, *faceret* as standing in *oratio*

meanings, and taking Prof. Sonnenschein's classification as a basis I should bring the use exemplified in this note decidedly under (b) not (a).

obliqua, and *virtual oratio obliqua* respectively for *condebatur*, *faciebat*. So too in No. 2 the subjunctives might be taken as expressing a tendency, or a prospect already realised in anticipation: 'an existence of which the continuance offered me nothing but overwhelming anguish, the renunciation, escape from all my troubles.' Attraction with *frangeretur* might also have its influence on the mood. But none of this is necessary, and in all these cases there is a certain presumption in favour of the prospective meaning owing to its undoubted presence elsewhere.

On No. 4 there is an instructive discussion in Fausset's note *ad loc.* (1) Henry Nettleship quotes No. 5 as a parallel, which he renders "'having obtained which, he would, or was to, be cast on the technical point." So here [i.e. in No. 4], "so (he thought) she might be, or would be, more easily killed," or "intending to kill her more easily." The imperfects express the future force of the subjunctive in past time.' This is in entire accordance with the view taken in this note, though attention is not explicitly called to the fact that in No. 4 there is, in No. 5 there is not *oratio obliqua*. It is also obvious that in No. 4, owing to the passive voice, futurity could otherwise be expressed only indirectly by *quae necari posset* (or *quam necari posse*): *quae necaretur* may well have been preferred as more concise and pointed. (2) Quite different is the view of H. J. Roby, that we may call the subjunctive 'simply hypothetical, i.e. apodosis with protasis *aucta pecunia, orbata filio*: "who would, if made richer, have furnished better reward for her death, and if deprived of her son, have been killed with less risk": R. § 1534, r. 642. One might have expected, instead of *quae . . . necaretur, quam necari posse*, so that this would have been dependent on *intellegebat*. But Cicero has chosen to put it independently.' It will be seen that 'independently' means in *oratio recta*, and that *necaretur* is taken as the apodosis in an ordinary past unfulfilled condition. But could the imperfect tense be justified? Fausset meets the difficulty thus: 'this imperfect subjunctive in past time answers to the present subjunctive in present

time—giving an assumption possible at the time of its making, but falling in the province of things past: the case is regarded as simply imaginary (not as unfulfilled).’ He quotes in illustration *Tusc.* I § 90 ‘Cur igitur et Camillus *doleret*, si haec . . . *eventura putaret*, et ego *doleam*, si gentem aliquam urbe nostra potituram *putem*?’ and *pro Clu.* 22 § 61 *Quid enim tandem illi iudices responderent, si qui ab eis quaereret . . . ?* Note, however, that the interrogative form in these passages permits us to regard the subjunctives in the main clauses as deliberative. But my chief objection to either of these views (for I take them to be distinct) is that (a) the separation of the clause *quae . . . necaretur* is extremely harsh and unnecessary, (b) the future reference of the imperfect subjunctive, which is surrendered in both alike, is irresistibly suggested both by the context and by

comparison with the other examples under discussion.

No. 12 is interesting, and I cannot but think that the recognition of the prospective use here greatly improves the force of the passage (*audiret* = *auditurus esset*)—indeed to take *audiret* as simply representing *audiebat* of *oratio recta* quite spoils the point. ‘While no one could believe that so much despatch would be shown in carrying messages which he would receive with regret.’ Strictly speaking, it was not the bulletins themselves, but their progressively adverse character, that was expected to cause Domitian satisfaction: but this is easily inferred from the Tacitean brachylogy.

W. J. GOODRICH.

*Bradford Grammar School,
Yorkshire.*

DOGMATIC DIVINERS AND PROPERTIUS.

IN June, 1916, Mr. Richmond published a series of contradictions to a series of conjectural notes on Propertius IV. x, which I had published in March of that year. Before continuing the miscellaneous adversaria on this author, of which that specimen moved Mr. Richmond’s protestations, I wish to reply in detail to the points which he makes, meeting in this way his challenge of methods. This article will examine in the series of counter-proposals, not whether Latinity and logic therein exhibited authorise Mr. Richmond to be heard on the subject—such an impertinence would outrage what little remains of the comity of scholars—but whether they are able to support the pretensions to exclusive competence which are there implicitly arrogated.

I fear that not many of the readers of the *C.R.* will have the patience or the curiosity to try this issue with exact application of mind, but will here beg anyone who can command enough of these two virtues, to read the two

articles side by side: for in order to moderate the length of my rejoinder, it has been necessary to proceed by allusion and by reference, not quoting Mr. Richmond’s words at large all the way through. If the matter were no more than a case of *καὶ κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ*, it would be worth nobody’s while; if only a few dubious readings in an ancient ditty were concerned, it would be silly to invite special attention; but there lies implicit (and easily to be disengaged) in the discussion of these passages, a question which affects the fundamentals of criticism. And criticism means the art of recovering truth from tradition and from documents in any part of History.

1. (a) On the noun *clausa* fem.

I do not press the suggestion *clausas aperire*, because the harshness of the zeugma in v. 2 is rather too aesthetic a difficulty to found upon. But the existence of *clausa* fem. is an interesting point; and as an instance of method it is worth while examining Mr. Richmond’s treatment of the case.

It appears to me wanting in consistency. Two classical examples of the word are alleged in the *Thesaurus*:

in foro aut in curia
posita potiusquam rure apud te in clausa. . . .
*Fragm. Com. Riebeck*³, p. 167.

Ribbeck prints these verses as trochaics: Mr. Richmond (who protests against dogmatism) dismisses Ribbeck with the remark: 'the verses are clearly iambic senarii,'¹ and proceeds to print a lacuna, after *in*, not after *clausa*; an elegant divination *cellula* is added; and finally he calls attention to the excellence of the jest thus produced, by adding (!) As who should say 'How absurd.' But where is the absurdity if you refuse Mr. Richmond's hypothesis? If we are to argue by punctuation, it would be a sufficient answer to print (?). But, to leave this case as merely possible, certainly not disproved, consider the next (*Moretum* 15):

et reserat clausae quae pervidet ostia clavi.

Mr. Richmond remarks '*clausae* seems to have been rightly emended by Scaliger to *casulae*.'

Observe that the MS. authority is swept aside in each case. But is it method that only in Propertius the reading of a hazardous combination of interpolated MSS. may be quoted as sovereign? And yet there are seven codices of the *Moretum* older than the Neapolitanus of Propertius. Why is the awful sentence, 'It has no MS. authority,' not good for Scaliger? Why is the integrity of the Propertius' tradition to be presumed greater than that of *Moretum*?

Next Propertius III. xiii. 39:

haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas.

Here as in some other cases Mr. Richmond begins to lay down the law before he has perceived the objection. It is a question of Latinity. Obviously *pudicas* is supposed to be for *puellas pudicas*; but is this Latin? Is not a mere assertion to this effect a little . . . dogmatic? Where are the analogies to show that an

adjective, when so used substantively, may be constructed with a participle which is itself adjectival? Seneca's language might be alleged

quae pati clausos iubet
Phlegethon nocentes igneo cingens vado.
Phaedr. 1226.

But then *nocentes* as a noun is too familiar in Latin poetry to need exemplifying. Mr. Richmond does not offer us even the Seneca passage. He talks of Science or Method; but judge his logic in practice, when he thinks to defend the Latinity of

haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas

by a citation of

ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas
(III. iii. 49).

What does this prove? That *puellas* is feminine? Or that *clausas* can mean cloistered? Markland, who conjectured

clausas expugnant arma puellas,

could evidently claim that line as making for his conjecture, and damning the reading which Mr. Richmond brings it up to support. It is hard to see why Mr. Richmond is so strong on this point at all: the honour of his *deteriores* is not at issue. We find him gaily accepting alterations of the two passages where the MSS. appear to attest the noun *clausa*; although to interpret *clausas* as a noun in this passage is in effect to vindicate *pudicas* against Dogmatic Diviners like Markland . . . who, though he lived more than a century before the foundations of British National Scholarship were laid (see Mr. R., *loc. cit.*, p. 116), happened to know a good deal of Latin.

(b) imbuis exemplo primae tu, Romule, palmas
huius, et exuvio plenus ab hoste redis.

Lachmann's reason for preferring *exuvio* to *eximio* (which Broukhuyzen liked) is a sound one, although he had not the scientific method to argue that, because a word is rare and archaic, it is therefore Propertian; I merely entered a reservation in favour of the possibility of *eximio*. However, Mr. Richmond (who protests against Dogmatism) pronounces these verses 'quite sound.' They at least furnish matter to bear him out when he disclaims divination. For he twice misses the point. It is a point

¹ Even if we grant that the accents *potiusquam rure apud te* favour an iambic rhythm, what divination enables Mr. Richmond to pronounce that the verses, when complete, were senarii and not octonarii?

not of Palaeography, but of Latinity in the one case, metric in the other. The question in debate here, as in many other cases, comes to this: *Are such and such words Propertius' Latin or Scribes' Latin?*

This question is asked here (1) in respect of the phrase *imbuere exemplum*, which raises no qualms in Mr. Richmond, although even Hertzberg's patient stomach was uneasy about it. What does it mean? Can it be vindicated by any analogy in Propertius or in Latin?

If the words are not Latin, but the residuum of Latin words falsely reported, they require emendation. Either a noun must be discovered under *exemplum*, which will fit with *imbuere*, or the reading of certain '*deteriores omnibus*' be accepted, or some other remedy found.

(2) In respect of the enjambment of *huius*. What may be the relevancy of Mr. Richmond saying '*huius* is defended by *haec arma* in 47,' it beats me to divine.

Again, I pointed out that it was both *prima facie* odd that the word *opimus* should not be named in this poem, and palaeographically not far-fetched to suppose the word lost in a line which offers the two nearly resembling sets of letters *primae* and *palmae*. To the former of these considerations Mr. Richmond replies '*opima spolia* not being archaic terms do not need to be named after v. 2.' 'Need' is not the question. It is a matter of literary probability. I ask the reader 'Is it, or is it not, probable that the technical word *opimus* will occur in a poem that deals with Fere-trius?' If he answers Yes, there is ground for proceeding to a further question: 'Is there anything in the *ductus litterarum* which would account for the loss of *opimus*?' But suppose it to be urged in answer 'Propertius deliberately avoids the technical term but suggests it by allusion.' This is worth examining: for poets often do avoid the *vox propria* deliberately. Not at the expense of the meaning, though. And here, even if *Exuvio* may suggest *spolia*, how can *plenus* suggest *primae palmae*? Mr. Richmond juggles with the equivocal 'prime' in English; but there is no

Latin correspondence between the ideas of *primus* and *opimus*; whereas '*plenus: opima :: exuvio: spolia*' are correlatives.

I can quote no direct authority for *palma opima*: but if a military victory can be called *palma* ('*egregiam istam palmam belli Punici patrati petis*,' Livy xxviii. 41), the particular victory which yielded *spolia opima* might, I suppose, be called '*palma opima*.' *Arma* was possible as well as *spolia*, e.g.

*opima apposui senex
Amori arma Feretrio,*

which shows that the technical sense of the adjective is not absolutely confined to the phrase *spolia opima* (cf. '*opima cadavera*,' Val. Flacc. iii. 143). But I submit the point to better judges of Latinity.

(c) *Cossus at insequitur Veientis caede
Tolumni.*

Mr. Richmond explains '*insequitur caede* is but a very slight extension of Virgil's *prosequitur dictis* and *votis*.' Many commentaries were written in the great Anglo-German period, when black and white met in a Higher Grey, on the principle that nonsense is an extension (often 'only a very little one') of sense.¹

Where *prosequi* and *insequi* are not synonymous with *sequi*, they signify respectively *attendance* and *pursuit*. When, as is frequently the case, they are qualified by an ablative, that ablative denotes the means: e.g. *prosequitur votis*, 'bear them company with prayers'; attached to *insequi*, the ablative expresses hostile means, e.g. *gladio stricto insequi*; but such an ablative can only attach to *insequi* when the verb has its transitive, not its neuter, sense. Accordingly the sentence of whose soundness the MSS. assure Mr. Richmond, would appear to mean—'Cossus hunts Romulus with the slaughter

¹ Mr. Richmond's method is simple: he thinks from English into Latin. 'Cossus follows with the slaughter of Tolumnius': quite good English. By, with, or from are represented by the ablative in Latin—that we all know who based our Latin on the deep and broad foundations of the primer; 'ergo Cossus insequitur caede Tolumni' is sound. One may conjecture that this is the inner process of Mr. Richmond's mind, because the pretext of an analogy which he snatches up and puts forward will not bear a minute's analysis.

of Tolumnius': a proceeding only possible if Cossus were an Erinyes, but unwarrantable in justice even so. Certainly this reading is inconvenient to me, as Mr. Richmond says: I find it inconvenient to common sense and Latinity; to say nothing of the gratuitous queeriness of order *Cossus at insequitur* instead of *insequitur Cossus*. But 'for my airy proposal there is no MS. support'; *inficitur* is a 'perhaps,' and nothing more. There are many other possibilities of course: emendation does not always come off at the first try. *Posse* in the pentameter may be for *Cosse*, and *Cossus* in the hexameter consequently interpolated: and so forth. But diagnosis must precede cure. I airily inquire, here as elsewhere, 'Is this Propertius' Latin or Scribes' Latin?' Propertius', Mr. Richmond protests. What tells him so? The Scribes.

- (d) nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti
cantat et in vestris ossibus arva metunt
(29-30).

Once more Mr. Richmond fails to see the point. I am aware that bones, when buried, may be turned up by the plough, or when cast away at sea may be rolled by the waters; but not that Veii has bones or that *in ossibus* is interchangeable in Latin with *inter ossa*. Apparently any sentence containing the word *ossa* satisfies Mr. Richmond. He cites Prop. II. xv. 44, where the poet in one sentence speaks of *ossa nostra*, 'the bones of us Romans,' and in the next personifies Rome herself as a mourning figure. Where is the relevancy of this? How does it help to prove that it is Latin even to say *Veii veteres, inter ossa vestra metunt*? And even allowing this, you have only reached the second line of objection: for where are the evidences to show¹ that for *inter ossa* you can substitute *in ossibus*?—the meaning of which may be seen in III. xvii. 9, 'quod veteres custodit in ossibus ignes.' It is kind of him to allow (undogmatically) that in these four lines the poet rises above mediocrity; *de gustibus non est disputandum*, but they seem to me to be

not the only passage where the poet's copyists sink him into solecism.

- (e) forte super portae dux Veius astitit arcem
colloquiumque sua fretus ab urbe dedit.

Without retorting Mr. Richmond's imputation of madness I would remark (1) that if he bases his argument on the supposition that

Herculeus Caenina ductor ab arce

means 'leaving the *arx Caenina*,' he need look no further than the ninth elegy of this book—

metuendo raptor ab antro (10)

to remind himself that the construction of which Virgil's *pastor ab Amphryso* (*Georg.* iii. 2) is perhaps the most familiar example, is not confined to Virgil.

(2) But may he not be right in taking *adstitit arcem* as a case of *astare* with the accusative? It is somewhat hazardous: Priscian names no author, and I can discover no earlier (or other) example than Paulinus Nolanus, xviii. 453,

tua comminus adsto

limina

for the right reading in Pliny (*Paneg.* 23) is pretty surely not *astaret* but *artaret*, as emended by Behr. However, the fact that Priscian says *astitit illum locum*, and the fact that in Paulinus the noun is also one of place, combine to make a case for *arcem*. Of course the palaeographical factor in the evidence is infinitesimal as between *acē* and *acē*. But now, without a thought of any of the other factors, Mr. Richmond plumps for *super porta*. I did not think it necessary to use the words 'scientific method' in any of my preceding adversaria, because I took it for an axiom that common sense, Latinity, and the usage of a particular author are three tests of the soundness of a reading. No scholar claims exclusive or private command of these; but they always have their value, whatever the fourth factor—the evidence of MSS.—may count for; it may count relatively high (in authors protected by ecclesiastical sanction or continuous use in school), or low (in authors—like Propertius—who disappeared from vogue in the sixth or seventh century).¹

¹ Sulpicius in the famous consolation (*ad Fam.* IV. 5) says *oppidum cadavera*. But anyone who can appreciate the Latin's discretion in metaphor will see that from 'the fallen lifeless remains of towns' it is a long step to 'the bones of Veii.'

¹ I think this may be inferred from the *Ibis* scholia.

Here is a case where the author's particular usage is an applicable test. Propertius uses *super* as a preposition eight times, never with an ablative; of these three happen to be with *astare*:

III. vii. 11.

sed tua nunc volucres astant super ossa volucres,

IV. vi. 29.

astitit Augusti puppim super,

and our present subject

super portae . . . astitit arcem.

Now if, as I argued (Mr. Richmond takes no heed of the point), *portae arcem* means nothing, what—I put it to any Propertian who has the patience to follow these minute controversies—what is the tendency of evidence as to the right reading? Is it not in favour of *super portam* and against constructing *astitit arcem*? It also disqualifies my former suggestion of *fronte super*, which was a vain endeavour to save *portae*.

(3) The question between *Veiuis* or *Veius* is chiefly a question of usage. No existing MS. of Propertius is of an age to carry much authority on points of orthography; and it is notorious that Renaissance copyists modernise in their spellings.

(4) *colloquiumque sua fretus ab urbe dedit*.

Mr. Richmond in a letter to me has suggested that

colloquiumque situ fretus . . .

is more probable than *astu*. At first sight this seemed very plausible; but on second thoughts it appears to have not much beyond a very slight palaeographical advantage over *astu*. Metrically *astu* is better. And, if it is an easy transition from *situ* to *sua*, it is not difficult to suppose an earlier corruption or *astu* into *situ* in any script, uncial or cursive.

(5) *di Latias iuvere manus*.

(1) 'But for F, *di Latias* would be in no way suspect.' How is it not suspect that the gods in general, instead of Jupiter—as the argument requires—decide this duel? Mr. Richmond has ignored, not answered, the objection.

(2) Passing by the exquisite piece of legerdemain which derives *romuleas* bodily from *di latias* by corruption in copying, we come here to a point where

the fundamentals are exposed. *Quaeritur*: Can a reading of F reasonably be preferred to the combined authority of all other MSS?—'in favour of a reading quite satisfactory in itself,' Mr. Richmond adds. Well, it has been shown that one must have a very frugal taste in probability, if one finds the reading is open to no objection; but supposing it to be 'quite satisfactory,' does that not all the more vindicate the integrity of *romuleas*?¹ If *di Latias* is unobjectionable, why should any corrector go out of his way to foist *romuleas*, which makes nonsense, into his text? If such a person existed, in any case, it cannot have been Coluccio, because his is the third hand in F, and this reading is in the first; it might just conceivably be Petrarch, though (by the way) I would not presume to call Petrarch 'a corrector with a little knowledge': he must have had mighty little knowledge if he thought *Romuleas iuvere manus* meant anything. What is far more probable is that this reading derives, through Petrarch's MS., from A.² but since Mr. Richmond apparently argues that N, dating about 1200, cannot have suffered the interpolations of a half-learned corrector, how can he contend that A, dating 1250-1300, is any less immune? And if the words are neither sense or grammar, how can their integrity be doubtful? And if they represent the tradition honestly, what does it matter that F dates only from 1380? I must plead guilty to having been so ignorant of history as to presume in the preface to my first edition, sixteen years ago, that N, as our only codex *renascentibus litteris antiquior*, was of unblemished integrity. Of course this ought not to have been so presumed. Anybody who has happened to read my occasional Propertiana in this journal knows that this juvenile error has long since been implicitly discarded. After the Caroline Renaissance there was never a period when scholarship was not capable of altering a nonsensical

Romuleas iuvere manus

into a tolerable makeshift

di Latias iuvere manus.

¹ Dr. Enk (*ad loc.*) concurs.

² See Ullman in *Class. Phil.* 6, pp. 284-8.

MSS. readings were tacitly emended, long before the Humanists, into Latinity of a sort. It is by the sort of Latinity that scholars, after long humbly and patiently immersing themselves in the language, may hope to become connoisseurs enough to see the difference between genuine and fake. The pedigrees of the dealers are not enough equipment for such discriminations.

- (g) haec spolia in templo tria condi causa
Feretri,
omine quod certo dux ferit ense¹ ducem;
seu quia vota suis umeris huc arma
ferebant,
hinc Feretri dicta est ara superba Jovis.

So I read the former couplet, with a reservation, for the moment, as to *ense*; Mr. Richmond reads—

nunc spolia in templo tria condita: causa,
feretri
omine, quod certo dux ferit ense ducem.

The first clue to the proper representation of this difficult quatrain is Propertius' elaborate, almost mechanical symmetry: the correspondences (chiastic) are:

(α and β indicate hexameter and pentameter.)

1. (α) in templo Feretri :: (β) Feretri ara . . .
Jovis
2. (β) omine certo :: (α) vota
3. (β) ferit :: (α) ferebant
4. (α) suis umeris :: (β) dux¹ ipse ducem.

To Mr. Richmond's arrangement I object, firstly—that *in templo* is left unmeaning, for want of a genitive: the question is not why the arms are in a temple, but why they are in Feretrius' temple rather than another's. Secondly, that his elliptical construction of *causa* is not Augustan Latin. Thirdly, that the authorities give no warrant for subtilising the etymology of *Feretrius* beyond *ferire* or *ferre*; if he were right in imagining that *ferre tria* was the key to the second couplet, the omission of the word *tria* would be a grave literary absurdity here; and only prophetically could the name apply to the cases of Romulus and Cossus. Fancy an etymology that only comes true after the first two occasions. Fourthly, that *omine certo* is a more pointed combination

than *certo ense*: for *omine certo* cf. Ov. *Met.* ix. 595, Val. Max. I. v. 4, Val. Flacc. v. 211, Sueton. *Aug.* 92. What is the *omine certum*? Plutarch answers: *εὐξάμενος οὖν ὁ Ρώμυλος εἰ κρατήσῃ καὶ καταβάλοι, τῷ Διὶ φέρων ἀναθήσει αὐτὸς τὰ ὅπλα. . . .* The hit is the omen. Romulus' weapon is a spear ('cuspidē,' v. 8, and *καταβάλοι* above). Acron's fall is the sign that Romulus' votum is accepted.

What are the alternatives to construing *omine certo*?

Feretri omine might be explicable on the analogy of *Jovis omine* in VII. vi. 23; but Mr. Richmond will not have it: he suggests that we should read *feretri omine* 'the sword . . . is an omen of the bier.' If this is a specimen of the national scholarship of our own which we are to build up (Mr. Richmond, *loc. cit.* 116), it will certainly be all our own. What is an 'omen of the bier'? *Omen mortis, omen fati*, etc., we know; but who ever said *omine feretri*? And, even supposing the Latinity could pass, observe that the whole pattern of the quatrain is destroyed by an artless intrusion of *ferre* (in the shape of *feretrum*) into the distich appropriated to the *ferire* etymology.

The reader will perceive that, if the constructions *in templo* . . . *Feretri* and *omine certo* are sound, suspicion is concentrated on the word *ense* from three sides, viz.: it contradicts *cuspidē* of v. 8 and *καταβάλλειν* in Plutarch; it is useless, because *ferire* absolute, and not *ferire* with one weapon rather than another, is the thing; and it usurps the place where, to balance *suis umeris* (*φέρων ἀναθήσει αὐτὸς* in Plutarch) and to represent Dionysius' *αὐτοχειρία* and Plutarch's *αὐτοργῶν*, *ipse* is required.

Before quitting this case, as a further example of the undogmatic method let me invite the reader to consider this. It was questioned whether *victa arma* could in Latin mean anything but 'the vanquished side in war.' How does Mr. Richmond prove the point? By stating

victa = a victore recepta.

Q.E.D.

I have now examined what Mr. Richmond calls his 'negative criticisms': the first word is well chosen, for his criticisms are for the most part mere denials,

¹ Dion. Italic. II. 34, αὐτοχειρία κατεργάσατο. Cf. Plutarch, *Romul.* xvi., αὐτοργῶν δὲ ἀριστίας στρατηγῶν στρατηγὸν ἀνελόντι δίδοται καθιέρωσις ὀπιμίων.

either unreasoned or supported by matters irrelevant to the point. Let us proceed to section B, in which my censor sticks in his thumb and pulls out a plum or two of his own, and says . . . But no. The epilogue deserves separate notice.

B.

(h) The structure of the poem.

I had the opportunity of trying the effect of an arrangement of Propertius' poems by stanzas when Mr. Lee Warner asked the use of my text for his beautiful Riccardi types. Such articulations can hardly be definitive without many published experiments; and satisfactory experiment can only be made by actually printing. Mine got a mixed reception. The late Professor Hardie, to whose judgment, on such a point, great weight attaches, was inclined to think it generally successful. America ἐπέσχε. But even a failure has scientific value. The book was issued in 1911. I had then an idea that the discovered schemes of the elegies would be a deterrent to transposition; and they do certainly serve to control and moderate the scale on which transposition can be accepted. But my objections to transposition were on principle. Mr. Housman's contention in individual instances might seem almost irresistible, but there was this prescriptive difficulty: unless the archetype once fell into the hands of a malignant monkey armed with scissors, what rationale could be assigned for such exceptional derangements? But since a hypothesis presented itself, which appears adequate to account for transpositions—namely, that Propertius, like Tibullus, was once excerpted, and the excerpta subsequently reintegrated amiss with the complete text—the eventual critical importance of recovering the stanza scheme receded for me somewhat. But of course, if the stanzas are a fact, the fact may have a value for another line of criticism altogether: it may suggest and confirm transpositions.

However, this poem was printed in the said edition, six years ago, as 4+4+8+6+8+8+6+4. Mr. Richmond's proposal to transfer 25, 26 to stand after 8 seems in every way a successful piece of divination, to be welcomed with candid congratulations.

- (i) hunc videt ante cavas librantem spicula
turris
Romulus et votis occupat ante ratis
(13, 14).

The second *ante* is neither nonsense nor solecism, but such poverty of composition is certainly offensive. If a merely aesthetic objection is ever sufficient to damn a reading, this reading may be called incredible. Mr. Richmond finds it 'not difficult to emend': a more difficult matter, and one which he has not attempted, would be to vindicate the Latinity of his emendation. He proposes

votis occupat arce ratis,

which he would have us interpret, apparently, 'Jupiter having signified the ratification of the vow in the Capitol.' Let me invite him, as a contribution to the new 'national scholarship of our own,' to explain how a local ablative can attach to *ratis votis*, and to produce any instance of *ratus* at all with such an ablative. Until he can do so, we must hold that *arte*, recommended by its palaeographical cheapness, fails to satisfy the tests to which every emendation must submit. But a conjecture may often, without solving, teach the rest to solve. A more searching scrutiny, advanced by previous eliminations, discloses a possibility of utilising *arce*. For suspicion is not restricted to *ante*. What does *occupat* mean? The commentators adduce IV. iv. 84, where Tarteia *vocales occupat ense canes*, i.e. φθάνει ἀποκτείνουσα. It would be natural and true to say that Romulus *occupat hasta*, but the words

voverat et spolium corrui ille Iovi

show that Romulus' vow is uttered before the hit. I conjecture that Propertius may have written

votis nuncupat arce ratis,

i.e. 'Romulus sees Acron and designates him as the Capitol in a successful prayer.' Does not this exactly fit the sequel? The *rata vota* consist of the next line

Juppiter, hic hodie tibi victima corruet, Acron.

Firstly, *Arce* has a true local meaning, for the *nuncupatio* takes place in the Capitol: therefore Jupiter is addressed. Secondly, Acron is, in fact, designated in the vow. (Perhaps there is a magic value in the actual naming.) For uses

of the ancient and solemn word *nuncupare* outside the familiar *nuncupare vota*, the lexicons furnish examples: in the very chapter in which Livy described this duel, you have this sentence—

ita deinde Dis visum, nec irritam conditoris
templi vocem esse qua laturos ea spolia posteros
nuncupavit,

i.e. *denuntiavit*, a rather less literal employment than we are supposing here.

(k) Urbis virtutisque pater sic vincere suevit
que tulit aprico frigida castra lare.

Mr. Richmond reads *aprico* and (1) says it makes sense. What sense? A sunny fireside? Having a sunny fireside he put up with a cold camp? (2) Defends the quantity *āprico* by a reference to *Culex* 98. But the line runs

talibus in studiis baculo dum nixus āpricas.

So this witness had better never have been called.

Against *apricas* there may be cited two examples from that sedulous imitator of Propertius, Silius Italicus, which confirm the opinion that, whether you prefer a *prisco* or a *parco*, the preposition is anyway indispensable.

hirtaeque togae neglectaeque mensa,
dexteraque a curvis capulo non segnis aratris
(i. 614).

a duro Frusino haud imbellis aratro
(viii. 398).

Romulus, coming from an old-fashioned (or hard-living) fireside, put up with the cold of the camp. One might hesitate at *tulit castra* for *patiens castrorum fuit*; but perhaps I. i. 8 'tu potes insolitas . . . ferre nives' is sufficient?

(l) Once more one may complain that, whether defending or impugning the form in which the poet's alleged words have been reported to us, Mr. Richmond's criticism regularly omits among the factors which make a cumulative proof or disproof, the little factor of Latinity. For

idem eques et frenis idem fuit aptus aratris
he conjectures

idem eques *effrenis*, idem fuit aptus aratris.

I have many times re-read his statement and yet am not quite certain whether *effrenis* is meant to be taken as nom. sing. of the post-Augustan form, or dat.

plur. masc. of *effrenus*. The latter seems to be his intention. If so, might one be so disobliging as to ask: Where is the direct evidence, or the analogy, for *effrenis* = *effrenis equis*?

Then, to pass from Latinity to the sequence of thought in the context, is this conjecture any happier on that head? Romulus lived simply (18); wolf-skin cap¹ and horsehair plume was his notion of a helmet (20); no jewelled armour (21); when he wanted a supple shield-strap, he got it by slaughtering his oxen (22). What does this indicate as the point of line 19? Romulus' versatility? Or merely his horsemanship? Surely not. To keep suit with the other three lines, the point must be the simplicity which made possible that essentially Roman combination of the military and the agricultural. Cavalry and ploughing—that is the contrast: by making it 'headlong cavalry charges' you destroy the elegiac balance, in which Propertius is usually so meticulous.

But although Mr. Richmond's conjecture thus fails to satisfy any requirement beyond that of palaeographical cheapness, which is only a fraction in the sum of critical probability, it would be a great mistake to imagine that conjectures serve no good purpose, even when they are demonstrably futile. There is no better means of solving a crucial passage than by clearing and narrowing the issue through the cross-examination of contending emendations. Such discussion has always been the means of rubbing rusty bits of text bright. With proper gratitude for the negative service, let us take another survey of the passage: *et* is undeniably offensive. Livineius tried to palliate it by adding a second:

idem eques *et* frenis idem *et* fuit aptus aratus.

The advantage of this suggestion is that it carries you a step forward by showing that *eques* is clumsy and otiose. To be *aptus frenis* one must obviously be *eques*; but the word *eques* ought not to be here, since *aptus aratris* has no *agricola* to balance it. The area of disease is thus defined. *Eques et* are alike suspected of being interpolated words.

¹ The leather cap is not distinctly military but peasant: see Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. 'galerus.'

What have they displaced? What is desiderated? Answer: A word to express the causal connection between Romulus' life at home and life in camp. Read '*inde idem frenis, idem fuit aptus aratus.*' *Inde* carries on the argument 'that is how he came to be both things.' A good example of *frena* = *equitatus* is Stat. *Theb.* xi. 244—

portarumque moras frenis assultat et hastis.

The palaeographical explanation is easy enough to satisfy the chastest exigencies: the familiar story of a haplography—a hole—a stuffing . . . and, for sequel, a flocking movement of thoughtlessness to vindicate the divine right of the usurper, in the name of Science.

(m) This calls for no comment. M. Havet has also pointed out that Baehrens was right. But the concentration of howitzer batteries, in order to crack this egg, is masterly.

- (n) illi virgatis iaculantis ab agmina braxis
torquis ab incisa decedit unca gula
(43-4).

M. Havet, in his *Notes critiques sur Propertius* (Paris: Champion, 1916), has made the plausible suggestion of *ansa* for *unca*. I note this provisionally, and proceed with the scrutiny of Mr. Richmond's invention in this last instance. He reads

illi virgatis iaculanti *sagmina* braxis,

and explains 'thus we discover that at the moment when he paid the penalty with the loss of his torque, or life-charm, from his sword-severed neck, the foe was aiming his *gaesum* at the life-charm of the Roman chief.' How do we discover this? By remarking that the scribe of N missed the letters *ab* and added them above the line. But if we suppose that this was a copyists' oversight (of the most ordinary kind in all ages) the palaeographical basis of Mr. Richmond's emendation disappears: for *agmina* instead of *agmine* is quite as well accounted for by Havet's reading *ob* for *ab*. On this head therefore it can hardly be rated higher than a possibility. Next, consider its aptitude in reality. Why 'a life-charm?' Neither Livy (I. xxiv. and xxx. 43), nor Pliny (XXII. 5), nor Festus (Lindsay, p. 425), give any such significance to these uprooted tufts of *verbenae*. The suggested parallelism of

charm with charm is arbitrary. However, let that pass. How the *fetiales*, whose emblem they were, carried these *φορήματα ιερὰ* (as Dionys. Halic. II. 72 calls them), we are not told; in their hands, we might infer, since none of the ancients took the trouble to mention this detail: as might have been expected, had the *sagmina* been carried in any peculiar manner about the person. Now, Mr. Richmond asks us to suppose that Virdomarus was taking shots at them. Surely an eccentric bullseye to select from the human target!¹

So much for the materialities. Now for the Latin. He translates *illi virgatis braxis* 'him of the striped breeks': a most surprising 'extension' of *illi* into the functions of an article. I should be glad to learn of any corroborative instance. It may be Latin to say, i.e. 'ille magnus, ille *ferox*, ille *virgatis braxis*'; but that *illi virgatis braxis* could stand for 'him of the striped breeks,' except in a beginner's Prose composition, I decline to believe on the strength of an *ipse dixi*: produce your evidence and the case may be altered. *Iaculari* can be constructed with an ablative . . . of the instrument. Could a Roman have construed Mr. Richmond's words any otherwise than 'to him as he was taking shots at the *sagmina* with his striped breeks'?

But since the elimination of absurdities is a part of scientific progress, let us now re-examine the context with an eye to reconciling as many probabilities as possible, without postulating, or straining reason to prove, the all-but-impeccability of the scribes. Here are four starting-points for a cumulative proof. Such a proof must take account of sins both of omission and commission in the tradition.

(1) *illi* is suspect, being at any rate very odd after *hic* in 41.

(2) The elegiac symmetry parallel to the arrangement

torquis { *unca* :: *decisa gula*.
 ansa

is missing.

¹ In order to prove that Propertius here represents Virdomarus as guilty of murdering ambassadors, he points out that Livy (differing therein from Propertius) so represented Cossus. Is this scientific method?

(3) Propertius' picture emphasises the swank and braggadocio of the Gaulish giant; his barbaric pedigree, barbaric prowess, barbaric dress.

(4) We have in Virgil's ecphrasis, likewise, a pictorial account of Gauls.

On the shield of Aeneas they are shown—

aurea caesaries ollis atque aurea vestis,
virgatis lucent sagulis; tum lactea colla
auro innectuntur; duo quisque Alpina coruscant
gaesa manu, scutis protecti corpora longis.

Aen. viii. 659-662.

The shield, the *gaesum*, the torque: these are common to both. *Bracae* are below the dignity of epic: Virgil leaves them to Propertius; but he adds a more characteristic part of Gaulish costume—the *sagulum*. Cf. Tacitus' account of Caecina *versicolori sagulo, bracas* [barbarum tegmen] *indutus* (*Hist.* II. 20); or Cicero's *sagatos bracosque* (*pro Font.* 15, 33).

(5) A neutral verb is required if *virgatis* . . . *bracis* is to attach to it, as descriptive ablative, e.g. *esse, ire, stare*. These considerations converge on a possibility that

IACVLANTISAB

is a syncopated and mis-divided relic of

SAGUL<IST>ANTISVB

SVB once mis-carved into S AB, AGMINE was substituted for TEGMINE.

The suspect *Illu* will then be stuffing introduced to fill the hole which had been caused by the telescoping of *saguli stanti* into *iaculanti*. On this hypothesis Propertius wrote:

virgatis saguli stanti sub tegmine bracis
torquis ab incisa decidit $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \text{unca} \\ \text{ansa} \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ gula.

'As he stood in tartan breeks under the shelter of his cloak, his torque dropped from him. . . . The elegiac balance is exactly re-established:

stanti : decidit
virgatis bracis : decisa gula
saguli sub tegmine : torquis ansa.

Since the words *sub tegmine* naturally recall to us the opening of the first Eclogue, it is not amiss to remind the reader that *sub tegmine* of a tree was then thought queer: the phrase usually indicated clothing: hence the parody of Virgil

Tityre, si toga calda tibi est, quo tegmina fagi?

But it may be said 'This is reckless: you tamper with the word *iaculanti*, which is above suspicion, being guaranteed by the parallel *librantem spicula* in 13.' Is it so guaranteed? The first engagement (Romulus and Acron) is fought with spears; in the second (Corvus and Lars Tolumnius) no weapon is mentioned, but the sword is obviously necessary for the final stroke—*desecta cervix*; what about the third? I cannot find it in any of the commentators, but I cannot help thinking that *incisa* necessarily implies an edge, not a point; i.e. a sword, not a spear. Will anybody produce an example of *incidere* used to describe the action of a pointed instrument, unless where it means to engrave, to score? But that cannot be Propertius' meaning here: Viridomarus' throat was cut, slashed, carved—certainly not merely scored. Probably it was cut through. If this position be irreducible, it appears consequent that *iaculanti* cannot be sound; for can a duel be conceived in which one man gets in a sword-stroke on his enemy's neck, whilst the other is throwing javelins at him?

Plutarch doubtless makes them fight with spears; but the disagreement in various picturesque particulars proves that he followed a different version of the story. Valerius Maximus uses the word *obtruncavit*, which makes for my view.

After reading and re-reading many times Mr. Richmond's concluding paragraph and enjoying the portentous solemnity of the prolocution, I am at a loss how to reply without a breach of the scholarly comities. He implicitly claims a peculiar competence to speak on Propertius, and suggests that, on these preserves, until his recension of the text be complete, the ordinary play of discussion and conjecture shall be suspended. As an humble diviner, only expecting an augural smile from my colleagues, it was disconcerting to find a protest and a sentence of exclusion. In the face of such enormous pretensions *difficile est satiram non scribere*; but I will restrict myself to a very few observations.

All that is public knowledge of the results of Mr. Richmond's researches, is

contained in the article which he published in *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxxi., No. 62. It is on the strength of this article, as an earnest, that we are admonished to wait until the oracle has spoken. Does the promise justify this ban? Without passing any opinion of my own on these results, I will quote the opinion of one who has also made a particular study of the MS. tradition of Propertius; and who apparently must be allowed to share with Mr. Richmond the qualifications which authorise Mr. Richmond to close this field against trespassers.

Mr. B. L. Ullman writes in *Classical Philology*, vol. vi., p. 300 '... I must confess I have not been convinced by the evidence thus far submitted. ... Much of his evidence is entirely subjective, depending on his view of the text in any given passage. He uses many readings of the new MSS. to support an emendation of his own. ... Misapplied palaeography, I am sorry to say, has affected Richmond's work, as it has that of so many other students of the fifteenth-century MS. Richmond's deductions from spelling are also valueless, in my opinion. ...'

In the face of this opinion are not the pronouncements in Mr. Richmond's last paragraph a little excessive? Any person found erecting a monument even in a by-way (I borrow the metaphor) will at first command a sympathetic interest. But if it proved to be a monument of nothing but patience? The University of Laputa had great monuments of patience. Suppose—to put it bluntly—Mr. Richmond has discovered a mare's nest? Fine scholars are not exempt from such misfortunes. One is reminded of the poignant words in which Rutherford lamented (in *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*) his dear time's waste on a matter and a method which he discovered, too late, was radically incapable of giving adequate results.

The question at issue is, of course, much broader than a given half-dozen readings in one poem: the fundamental principles of *ars critica* are involved. Mr. Richmond is preaching the Leo-Vollmer doctrine. I will confess that it was Leo's *Culex*, a most shame-

less book, which did much to disabuse me of the characteristically German notion that 'science' means setting up a sacred machine which will work automatically. The pages of this journal are not the place for an *ars critica*, even in the briefest abstract; but let me, in conclusion, outline a prescriptive argument against Mr. Richmond's position: he attempts to reconstruct the stages in the Propertius tradition that lie behind our earliest surviving witnesses, N and A. Good. Suppose his method to be as sure as Mr. Ullman finds it unconvincing; suppose he arrives at a hypothetical Caroline codex: what reason is there to imagine that this was less corrupt, less in need of emendation by conjecture, than (say) the lost Sangallensis of Statius' *Silvae* or the Bembinus of *Appendix Vergiliana*? Suppose he reconstructs the sixth-century stage, why should it be sounder than the Romanus of Virgil? Virgil edited from the Romanus is faulty enough. Suppose his genial but hazardous speculations can be carried even as high as the age of the Symmachi, would such a Propertius be more authoritative than the Bembine Terence? Yet the Bembine needs frequent emendation, though there were strong causes making to preserve the integrity of Terence, which were wanting to Propertius. Who is going to accept the claim that a hypothetical evolution of a lost archetype is more impeccable than we know its real contemporaries to be in the instances just quoted? And, if not, why do the ordinary processes and tests not apply to the emendation of Propertius?

Proof has been submitted that Mr. Richmond's postulate is inadmissible. But he has enriched the art of Heinsius and Markland with a new (and alliterative) nickname.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.

P.S.—This article was in type before Lejay's paper 'Les Élégies romaines de Propertius' (*Journal des Savants*, 1915-6) came into my hands. No scholar can afford to miss anything from so masterly a pen.

NOTES

DIOGENES LAERTIUS I. 104
AND I. 77.

καὶ τοῦτο ἔφη [Ἀνάχαρσις] θαυμασιώτατον ἑωρακέναι παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅτι τὸν μὲν καπνὸν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καταλείπουσιν, τὰ δὲ ξύλα εἰς τὴν πόλιν κομίζουσιν.

In *Platonica*, p. 336, Mr. Herbert Richards has written: 'I can make no sense of καπνόν, and conjecture καρπόν. There was a regular Greek expression, ξύλινος καρπός, *tree fruit* (see Liddell and Scott, and add Diod. 3. 63. 2: Artem. *Oneir.* 2. 37, p. 133), which we may remember in relation to ξύλα.' The olive seems to be the only tree that suits the conditions of this emendation, and few owners could have been so improvident. But the text itself gives an admirable sense. Take ξύλα as *ligna*, not as *materia*. Anacharsis was the shrewd representative of a primitive folk, interested in the devices of civilisation. Knowing the Ἰλαία of Scythia (Hdt. IV. 76), he might well wonder at the charcoal industry, say, of Acharnae, where smoke was purged from the wood before the charcoal was sent down into Athens.¹ Foreigners are readily interested in the fuel peculiar to any country. The two things which Aeneas Silvius particularly records of Scotland are the 'sulphurous stone' which men burned, and his failure to see the goose-barnacle, which was always farther north. The smokelessness of charcoal was a problem which later Greeks explained by supposing that the smoke was shut up in the wood—a less picturesque theory than that of Anacharsis. Cf. Theophrastus, *De Igne* 75: οἱ δ' ἄνθρακες γίνονται μὲν μέλανες ὅτι ἐγκατακέκλεισται ὁ καπνὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, (ὅς) μέλας ὢν φύσει καθάπερ βάπτει κ.τ.λ.

I. 77. In this passage someone said to Pittacus: δεῖν ζητεῖν ἄνθρωπον σπονδαῖον; and he answered: ἂν λίαν ζητῆς, οὐχ εὐρήσεις. The proposed emendation of Mr. Richards is κἂν λίαν ζητῆς

(p. 328). Now Diogenes the Cynic might have said this, but the text as it stands suits the character of an experienced politician—'yes, there are good men, provided you don't probe too deep.' Walpole's remark about the price of certain people is in the same cynical vein—they are honest *till* their price is reached.

A. S. FERGUSON.

Queen's University,
Kingston, Canada.

LEUCAS—ITHACA.

IN the winter of 1832-3 Richard Hurrell Froude sailed about among the Ionian Islands as follows. From Malta he reached Zante, passing between Zante and Cephalonia, then called at Patras, sailed for Corfu by the channel between Ithaca and Cephalonia, after a week in Corfu returned to Patras, passing between Ithaca and Acarnania, and thence to Zante and back to Malta. It will be agreed that he could not have had better opportunities for observation. Now what are the comments of one whom his friend Newman called 'one of the acutest and cleverest and deepest men in the memory of man'? They are these. 'Homer was no geographer, for he says of Ithaca, αὐτὴ μὲν χθαμάλῃ πανυπερτάτῃ εἰν ἂν κείται πρὸς ζόφον. Ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλαὶ νῆσοι, etc. Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ Ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος, πρὸς ἧῷ τ' ἡέλιόν τε. This zigzag quotation will hardly pass for evidence, but it is somewhere in the *Odyssey*, and the πρὸς ἧῷ τ' ἡέλιόν τε, are Homer's words, which makes me think he was never there, or that we have got hold of wrong names for the islands.' Froude had no copy of the *Odyssey* with him, but his contention is absolutely correct. The editor of his *Remains*, J. B. Mozley, adds in a note that the passage may perhaps be reconciled with the geography by referring the lines to Zacynthus, not to Ithaca, 'which the Greek will very well bear.' As 127-8 must refer to Ithaca, and plainly are applied to the island πανυπερτάτῃ πρὸς ζόφον, this expedient must be unhesitatingly

¹ The story of Ephorus that Anacharsis invented ζῶπυρα points to his interest in the subject. (Strabo, 7.9).

rejected. If Ithaca is 'furthest of all to the west,' and distinguished from the other three, the meaning of ἀμφί cannot be pressed against the Leucas-hypothesis. There are islands to the east of Santa Maura and also to the south of it. As the identification of Dulichium with Leucas, proposed by Bunbury and now adopted by Mr. Shewan, is becoming fashionable, it will be well to add a word against it. The three islands are contrasted with Ithaca in α 245 and ι 21: it is plain then they are the νῆσοι πρὸς Ἡλίδος contrasted with Ithaca in φ 346. Now

so impartial a witness as Dr. Barclay Head in his *Historia Nummorum* describes the coins of historic Cephalonia, Ithaca and Zacynthus under the heading 'Islands off Elis.' Secondly in § 334 the Thesprotian ship is said to pass Ithaca on its way to Dulichium: the story is a fiction, but the local colouring must be correct. Thirdly Dulichium is plainly the larger island: it supplies fifty-two suitors (π 247). Cephalonia has 689 sq. kil., Santa Maura only 287.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Oriel College.

REVIEWS

THE ODES OF PINDAR.

The Odes of Pindar, including the principal Fragments. With an Introduction and an English translation by Sir JOHN SANDYS (Loeb Classical Series). London: William Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915. 5s.

THAT this translation is scholarly and dignified goes without saying. Perhaps more could not be looked for under the restrictions imposed by the plan of the Loeb Series, which places text and translation side by side and allows only the irreducible minimum of notes. Excellent for the purposes of the series, this plan doubly handicaps the translator of Pindar. He must be fairly literal to avoid perplexing readers who have the Greek before their eyes, even when the letter killeth understanding; and he is denied the full commentary without which his author must remain often unintelligible, and oftener dull, to the modern mind. The unique splendour of Pindar's poetry is of course incommunicable in any version; but, apart from that, his most baffling quality is his unique allusiveness. Working under the τεθμός of Lyric, he invented and gradually perfected a 'method of allusion,' so to name it; and deals perpetually in references to mythology, to proverbial philosophy,

to the whole range of Hellenic life and ideas, which for us ἐμπέσεων χατίζει, though we cannot doubt that they were readily grasped by the public he wrote for. Otherwise, however successful in other branches of poetry, he could never have been a 'best seller' as a writer of Epinicians.

It is, or was, the fashion to assume that Pindar must have been as intrinsically difficult to his contemporaries as he is to us; and that they followed his train of thought only by help of clues in the shape of 'signal-words,' 'metrical responsions,' and the like; in fact, that he used a sort of cypher, the key to which they possessed, but we need to rediscover. But the more patiently and perseveringly one reads him, the more it seems that the true 'Open, Sesame' to Pindar must be sought in another direction; at any rate, that the *via prima salutis* is to reconstruct, as far as may be, the mental standpoint of his audience, and to ask ourselves continually, 'What would this passage have conveyed to the average fifth-century Greek?' And the answer, in many cases, will depend precisely on our seizing the significance of an allusion, which is sometimes given in a single phrase, or even a single word. Take, for illustration, the word γαστήριμαργος in *Ol. I. 81*.

Following Myers, who followed Paley, Sir John Sandys translates γαστρίμαργος by 'cannibal.' The word, of course, means no such thing, and, if it did, would make nonsense of the context. For the gods did not know it was human flesh that Tantalus offered them; and to accuse Demeter, who alone ate of it before the truth was discovered, of 'cannibalism,' could occur to nobody. Pindar might as well say, 'I refuse to call Thyestes, or Harpagus, a cannibal.' So would everyone else. What, then, does he refuse, with abhorrence, to call the goddess—implying, at the same time, that others did call her so, on the strength of the story he rejects? Simply a 'greedy-belly'—or any other strong term you like for a glutton. The point being that, according to the tale, Demeter had 'wolfed' a whole shoulder of Pelops before the other gods had time to begin their meal. That was why they had to supply him with his famous 'ivory shoulder,' on restoring him to life. There are other traces in myth of a certain greediness being popularly attributed to the Earth goddesses. Persephone, e.g., could not resist eating the fatal pomegranate in the Nether World. Now, remembering the prominence of the Demeter and Kore cult in Sicily, and that Hiero himself was their hereditary priest, we can see the special relevance in this Ode of Pindar's protest against the accepted Pelops legend. He throws it overboard, and invents another version, because it involves the abominable assumption that Demeter was guilty of γαστρίμαργία—a vice more repulsive to the Greeks than to us, by whom the virtue of temperance has been so curiously limited that we never think of denying it to the most voracious teetotaller.

Points such as these—and they are legion—cannot be brought out except by ample explanatory notes. It is, then, no disparagement to the present translation to say that it will not help English readers to a fuller comprehension of Pindar's thought; what they will find in it is a version in style resembling that of Myers, but more faithful and less florid, which can be read with pleasure and interest either

alongside the original or independently. This, one takes it, was the object in view; and, if so, the result is thoroughly satisfactory.

A few criticisms may be offered on particular renderings:

1. *Ol. II.* κείναν παρὰ δίαταν, 'to gain a scanty livelihood,' *pace* most editors, is indefensible. (a) This use of παρὰ is unexampled in Pindar; (β) κείνός means 'vain,' 'fruitless,' not 'scanty'; (γ) δίατα means 'way of living,' not 'means of living,' in ordinary Greek. Read κείναν, and translate 'in yonder happy home.' For δίατα meant also 'dwelling-place,' 'home,' and so came to mean τόπος ἐν ᾧ εὖ διάγομεν (*Schol. Nic. Eth. I. 6. 3*). We may suspect that in Orphic or Pythagorean parlance it denoted specially the Underworld Paradise, and does so here. (*Cf. Aristophon, Pythagoristia ap. Diog. Laert. VII., "Ἐφη δὲ καταβὰς εἰς διαίταν τῶν κάτω | ἰδεῖν ἐκάστους. . .*)

2. *Ol. VI. 60.* αἰτέων λαοτρόφον τιμάντων ἐὰ κεφαλᾷ, 'praying that his head might be crowned with honour and with the care of the people.' This misses the force of ἐὰ κεφαλᾷ, 'to be his alone'; *cf. Ol. VII. 66* (γαῖαν) ἐὰ κεφαλᾷ . . . γέρας ἔσσεσθαι. There, as here, the context suggests that the phrase may have been a formula in solemn covenants. τιμάν is not 'honour,' but 'a lordship,' or 'province,' like γέρας above; while λαοτρόφος is 'folk-nurturing,' i.e. well-peopled (*cf. πόλιν λαοτρόφον, Ol. V. 4*).¹

3. *Ol. VII. 5.* συμποσίου χάριν, 'for the sake of them that sit at meat with him' ('at drink with him,' Gildersleeve). This quotation from *St. Matt. xiv. 9* does not strike one as happy, even if the Scholiast is right in taking συμποσίου of the guests present, which may be doubted. It suggests that the host, like Herod, acted under fear of censure from them.

4. *Pyth. III. 20.* ἤρατο τῶν ἀπειόντων. 'She was enamoured of an absent love,' is quite wrong, as the context makes obvious. The δαίμων ἕτερος (*l. 34*)

¹ We have the same conception of Heroic kingship in *Ol. IX. 100*—πόλιν δ' ὥπασεν λαόν τε διατᾶν. In *Ol. VI.* Apollo responds to the prayer of Tamos for such kingship by summoning him πάγκοινον εἰς χώραν (*109*).

which led Koronis to sin is certainly not a 'hateful doom'; perhaps the nearest we can get to it is 'her evil genius' (see 6 *infra*).

5. *Pyth.* IV. 227. The subject of *πέλασσαν* is not Jason, but Aeetes, clearly. L. 293, *εὔχεται ποτὲ οἶκον ἰδεῖν*, can hardly mean 'the exile *anoweth* that he shall see his home again.' Such an assertion would be utterly out of keeping with what precedes, and ill-calculated to conciliate Arcesilas.

6. *Nem.* V. 40. 'The natal star,' for *πότμος συγγενής*, is perhaps a little misleading. A man's *πότμος συγγενής*, or *δαίμων*, is the Greek equivalent of the Roman 'Genius,' and *συγγενής* is simply 'born along with.' 'Birth-Spirit' partly gives the idea; but here again translation must fail without a note.

7. *Nem.* VI. 25 f. *ἕτερον οὐ τινα οἶκον ἀπεφάνατο πυγμαχία <πλέονων> | ταμίαν στεφάνων μυχῷ Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσας*. 'No other house hath the contest in wrestling (*sic*) proclaimed the possessor of more crowns in this inmost place of Hellas.' The sense is missed by neglecting the metaphor. The Bassids are stewards to that wealthy dame, Pygmalion, who *makes them give account* from time to time of the crowns in their storechamber. With *ταμίαν* and *μυχῷ* close by, it is strange enough that the force of *ἀπεφάνατο* should be

overlooked; but it is almost incredible that editors and translators should agree to take *μυχῷ* with *Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσας*. Yet they do, only differing as to whether Nemea, Corinth or Aegina is the *μυχός*.¹ *Ἑλλ. ἀπ.* rounds off Pindar's 'mighty vaunt,' which is that the Bassids' crowns are more than all Hellas besides can show in any one clan.

The treatment of the text is—most wisely under the circumstances—eminently conservative. Of 'the few emendations for the first time admitted into the text,' Bergk's *τ' ἐλαφρόν* (for *τε λάβρον*, *Nem.* VIII. 46) commends itself least. It is an anti-climax after the mournful and solemn *οὐ μοι δυνατόν*, just preceding. One could wish such an outrage to Pindar as *ὄρθιον ὄρυσαι* (*Ol.* IX. 109) had not passed unchallenged. Sir John Sandys has made several proposals for filling the lacunae in some of the recently discovered Fragments; and the inclusion of these Fragments, along with a translation, adds not a little to the interest and value of this book.

W. M. L. HUTCHINSON.

¹ I ought to have excepted Fennell, whom I have looked at since writing the above. He writes 'the phrase is intolerable'; and explains the whole sentence as I do, noting that *ἀπεφάνατο* is 'gnomic aorist and causal middle.'

GALEN ON THE NATURAL FACULTIES.

Galen on the Natural Faculties. With an English Translation by ARTHUR JOHN BROCK, M.D. (Loeb Classical Library). One vol. 12mo. Pp. xxxix + 339. London: Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.

THIS volume is one more instance of that intelligent interest in Galen, and new understanding of him, which during the last half-century has followed the destruction of a servile idolatry. If we overlook a little mathematics, a little astronomy, and some Arabian chemistry, Galen, who flourished under Marcus Aurelius, was the last, as with all his

faults he was one of the greatest, men of science until Roger Bacon. Two or three editions of single treatises of Galen I have noticed before in the C.R. and have taken occasion to point out the need of a modern edition of his works with full and constructive commentaries. For the history of science, literature, and philosophy the works of Galen are full of matter. With these studies philology must of course go hand in hand; but the labours of Helmreich and others (*Corpus Medicorum*—International Association of Academies) have already done much to establish a text which before could hardly be said to exist; the standard edition,

that of Kühn, though decorated with the name of Dindorf, has no pretensions to accurate scholarship.

This treatise on the Natural Faculties (*π. φυσικῶν δυνάμεων*) is well chosen for translation by the Editors of the Loeb Series. In respect of the history of physiology it is enlightening; it reflects light also on Galen's character as a man and as a scientist. As Dr. Brock says, 'Within its comparatively short compass we meet with instances illustrating perhaps most of the sides of this many-sided writer.' His anatomical books have already their excellent translation and commentaries (in German) by Simon. Treatises more directly medical are less useful as bridges of time; for this end our art is too various, personal, and fluctuating; too dependent on ancillary sciences and on apparatus, and in scope too utilitarian.

Dr. Brock's translation is spirited, idiomatic, scholarly, and often happy; thus it is very readable by itself. Moreover he has shown much discrimination in varying his rendering of particular words according to the connotations of the context—such words for instance as *φύσις*, *φυσιολογία*, *θεωρία*, *θεωρητόν*, *ἀκολουθία*, *περισταλτικός*, etc. The notes are few and close to the point. Dr. Brock has added a useful and interesting Introduction, well-informed, helpful and judicious. On special lines the translator has had the advantage of assistance from many friends; among them were, for scholarship, Mr. Pickard Cambridge; for biology, Sir W. Thistleton-Dyer and Professor D'Arcy Thompson. He had also of course the aid of Daremberg's French translation, and of the Latin of Linacre. The translation follows the Greek so compactly that the two texts closely correspond page for page. Kühn's paging is indicated throughout, a great convenience. But as regards the paging of this volume—what demon is tempting some recent publishers to play tricks with the ancient seat of page numbers? Surely the customary and convenient place for these is at the upper right-hand corner; but here the printer has thrown these numbers to the bottom of the page, a plaguy discommodity.

To pass now from the translation to the context of this treatise: I have spoken of the bridge of time and tradition; in respect of ancient medicine we may regard as main piers on the medical route the Hippocratic, the Alexandrian, and the Romano-Greek. Of the Hippocratic school we have no inconsiderable body of documents, copies of which were never lacking in Greece, Alexandria, or Rome. Of the great and brilliant medicine of Alexandria however but a meagre collection of second-hand scraps remains; little indeed remained of it in the days of Galen, or even of Celsus, to both of whom nevertheless we are indebted for much of the remnant.

The chief masters of Alexandria were the physicians and anatomists Herophilus and Erasistratus; great men both, but of divergent opinions. Their disciples were divided accordingly; Herophilus followed more directly in the steps of Hippocrates, accepting in full the doctrine of the four humours; Erasistratus, following rather in the steps of the great Ionian physicists, ignored the four humours, and inclined to physical speculations, such as the atomist and the pneumatist. Consequently in therapeutics he leaned rather to physical, Herophilus to pharmaceutical methods. Galen was nurtured in the later Alexandrian schools of Asia Minor—at Smyrna and Pergamon, in the following of Quintus (*Κόιντος*)—known as the *ἀνὴρ ἀνατομικώτατος* of his period—and Satyrus; stanch Herophileans, and antagonists of the 'iatromechanical' Erasistrateans. Defective as were Galen's documents concerning the opinions of a scientific ancestor four centuries before his time, yet there is no doubt that the atomist speculation, brilliant and prophetic idea as it was, at that time of immaturity was a fantastic basis for physiology, as fantastic as the Timaeus. For example; great anatomist as he was, Erasistratus was beguiled by it into the proposition that the urine reached the bladder as a condensation of vapours driven by the innate heat through the interstices of all parts of the body; thus ignoring the ducts (the ureters) by which the waste products, drawn by the kidneys from

the renal arteries, trickle into the bladder. Galen had no difficult task in denouncing such false applications of the atomist hypotheses, out of which, about 50 B.C., the Methodist and iatromechanical schools had arisen, and reached their zenith in the time of Hadrian, in the person of Soranus, a physician scarcely eclipsed by Galen but in his day less eminent.

But in this treatise, as elsewhere, combative as he was, Galen shows himself as far more than a destructive critic. By the 'Natural Faculties,' of which he deals here with four, he signifies in physiology 'causes of specific activity'; as in pathology the four humours were causes of disease. The four Faculties were (i.) attraction by each organ of the body of certain elements of the nutritive juices proper to its structure (*ὁλική τοῦ οἰκείου*); (ii.) retention of these; (iii.) alteration of each to its own kind (*κατὰ τὴν ποιότητα κινεῖσθαι*); (iv.) rejection of the inappropriate (*περίττωμα* or *τὸ ἀλλότριον*). This sound and original conception differed profoundly from the doctrine of 'homoiomerism,' in which it was assumed that the constructive materials were in substance a blend of kinds already identical in quality with the several bodily tissues concerned, a blend from which each tissue sorted out its own: e.g. in a piece of bread the formative particles of bone, muscle, nerve, brain, etc., pre-existed, and needed only the unravelling. Against this portmanteau hypothesis Galen in his prolix, redundant, but logical and eloquent style vigorously protested. But this specific attraction was in his opinion aided by another principle, by the vacuum of the Aristotelean Straton (*πρὸς τὸ κενούμενον ἀκολουθία*), a cooperative mode of nutrition adopted alike by the vitalist Galen and the physicist Erasistratus.

As regards the heat of the body—for Galen the 'innate heat'—there is little here to say, and this little could not well be discussed without some account of the 'pneuma,' and of the pneumatist school, so carefully worked out by Wellmann. The interesting anticipation by the ancients of oxygenation and combustion as the source of animal

heat Huxley, in an *obiter dictum*, attributed to Galen. Galen did no more than accept this idea from the great Ionians, and progressed no farther in it. Unfortunately one of the fathers of the Alexandrian school—Praxagoras of Cos—had taught that the arteries, empty as they are in necropsy, were also empty of blood during life, and served as the channels of the pneuma. Galen, it is true, showed by experiment that the arteries contained certain finer elements of the blood with pneuma; but this was shown long before his time, at any rate for the aorta; for example, by the writer of the tract *π. καρδίας*, which is included in the Hippocratic Collection, but was probably contemporary with Aristotle. Galen unfortunately was somewhat disconcerted by some of his own experiments, on account of the clotting of the blood in the arteries ligated. On the mechanism of the circulation Galen was not indeed so clear as Erasistratus.

In respect of Therapeutics Galen fell behind Erasistratus and Asclepiades, to the latter of whom, influenced perhaps by Greenhill, Dr. Brock may be a little less than just. If the opinions of these leaders drifted into the sterile practice of Methodism, those of Galen led to the humoral purgations, polypharmacies, theriacs, venesections and crass dogmatisms in which, down to the time of Molière, medicine—Byzantine, Arabian, and modern—was enthralled, fetters which even now are not entirely cast away.

In the present treatise however we see, in the vivid light of undesigned conversation, the chief merit of Galen: that so far as we know—the records of Alexandria being lost—he was the first in physiology, perhaps the first man of science, not merely to make experiments—even savages and dogs make experiments—but to pursue the experimental method for the testing of premises and hypotheses. In this treatise again and again it is interesting to see how at every point of debate Galen drives his opponents to *try*, to put his proposition to experimental tests. Do as I have done, he urges; make such and such an experiment and see. And the experiments he proposes are well

conceived and fairly conclusive. (See e.g. pp. 87, 241-3, 273, 279.) But they would not do it for Galen, as they would not for Harvey. Of his larger systematic and more disinterested experimental researches those on the spinal nerves by no means stand alone. Un-

happily for the world, and for his own reputation, that which was wrong in Galen flourished, that which was right in him sank into oblivion. Such are the freaks of history.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

DEIGMA, A FIRST GREEK BOOK.

Deigma, a First Greek Book. By Profs. C. F. WALTERS and R. S. CONWAY, with the cooperation of CONSTANCE I. DANIEL. Pp. xxiii + 407. Murray. 3s. 6d.

No praise could be too high for the comprehensive care with which the authors have compiled this book. It is designed for beginners (whom it is to occupy for two years) and contains everything needed for such a course, much more, in fact—as, for example, remarks on metre—than is usually to be found in such a course. To praise its scholarship would be an impertinence, but I cannot refrain from a word of admiration for the very lucid little philological notes with which it abounds. Their appropriateness—in a beginners' course—is another question, and one upon which I should probably find myself in disagreement with Professors Conway and Walters, but they are excellent for the teacher to have by him for reference and reminder of the reasons for different grammatical forms and linguistic peculiarities. The whole book is, in fact, more adapted to the intelligent teacher than to the intelligent pupil. Professors Conway and Walters have endeavoured to do a service to us humbler schoolmasters by placing their *σοφία* at our disposal, but the *σοφός* (as Aristotle tells us) *πολλάκις διαμαρτῆσεται τῆς θεραπείας* for lack of *ἐμπειρία*. In a beginners' book simplicity of presentation is more desirable than philological or scientific exhaustiveness; but in this book the presentation both of accidence and of syntax is full, exhaustive, accurate, scientific or what you will, but certainly not short and simple. In fact, the book (which resembles the authors' *Limen* not only in its format) is almost like a labyrinth. This

effect is, perhaps, nowhere more striking than in the treatment of conditional sentences, which is scattered over more than fifty pages! Nowhere is there given a simple table of the common forms, which, by being *εὐσύνοπτος*, would have done more to help the pupil to grasp the principles of such sentences than all the excellent examples and explanations which the authors have scattered over so large a field. (Incidentally, why do they use the ugly words *Protase* and *Apodose*?)

The arrangement both of accidence and syntax is good—thus the subjunctive does not occur until p. 196, and one can go a long way in Greek without the subjunctive; the middle voice comes right at the beginning (and why shouldn't it, since middle verbs are so common?); but there is some lack of coordination, for which the reason is not apparent. The imperfect occurs in §14, and the second aorist in §64—and this in spite of the fact that *ἰδεῖν*, *εἶδομεν* and *ἤλθον* are all used in intervening sections, and it is not until §42 that we are told that such words are declined like the imperfect. Then why should not the pupil be told that *αὐτός*, for example, and the relative are declined like the article? This would have obviated the necessity of having the oblique cases (with English equivalents appended) scattered over several early vocabularies to the exercises. The reading material is good; we soon get on to continuous narrative of a simple nature, and this is continued throughout the book, the earlier portions being specially written and the later ones adapted from Herodotus and others. Questions in Greek are appended to many of the exercises, and the Preface says 'We think that a case has been made out for the use of conversation in

Greek and Latin as a regular part of the school work,' and it is implied that the book can be used on the Direct Method. Few Direct Method teachers, however, will agree; for the exercises consist of the usual fragmentary, isolated sentences which we associate with the most old-fashioned of primers. In fact, the fragmentary nature of such exercises almost seems to be regarded as a virtue, for on p. 119 we find an exercise of which the first half is made up from the early chapters of Plato's *Apology*. As the exercise stands it can have no human appeal whatsoever to the pupil (he does not even know that the person referred to is Socrates!) and its place could so easily have been taken by a connected piece of Plato (adapted, if necessary). It is one of the objects of the book 'to bring the pupil as soon as possible to the stage of reading Greek authors,' and the reading material provided is, as already stated, unusually good. (More Anacreontics would have been welcome.) But he is to spend two years over the book; what amount of Greek will he have read in that time? He will read a great deal of Greek accident and syntax, and a few gems of Greek literature, it is true; but it would have been much better to let him read more Greek literature while gradually extending his knowledge of Greek accident and syntax by semi-conscious inductive processes. As it is, the first hundred pages of this book contain—allowing thirty lines to a page—about four pages of isolated Greek sentences and seven of continuous Greek narrative. All the rest is δειγμα!

In a book with so many good points—in addition to the spirit of the reading matter, *i.e.* that of simple, continuous,

narrative, I should mention the marking of \tilde{a} , \tilde{i} and \tilde{u} , the treatment of the way nouns, *e.g.* of the third declension are built up, with verbs from the same stems, and the reasoned explanation of such things as $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon} \mu\eta$ with Future Prohibitions—criticism of details is perhaps a little carping, but why are there no paradigms of moods? These are of great use in teaching, and they would have helped the pupil through the labyrinth considerably.

So much for details; the general effect of the book is far from satisfactory. That two scholars of the standing of Professors Conway and Walters should have thought it worth while to produce a book which does so little for the improvement of Greek teaching is anything but a credit to English scholarship. They have heard of improved methods of teaching, and have thought it well to incorporate some few reformed details (presumably because they think them good) into the body of their work, but seem blind to the fact that the value of reformed methods lies in the very principle or *soul* of the teaching and cannot be attained by any such partial *incorporation* of details as they have attempted. In fact teachers on reformed lines who really understand their work ought to receive this book with something little short of dismay, for there is danger that by its coquetting with reform it may retard progress for many years to come.

The book has been very accurately printed; I have been carefully through it and have found only one error— $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ on p. 177 for $\epsilon\tilde{\iota} \tau\iota\varsigma$. Ἀισχυλός on p. 262 I am forced to refer to the authors themselves, for it is twice repeated in the vocabularies.

R. B. APPLETON.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XII. Edited with translations and notes by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. With 2 plates. Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman branch. H. Milford, Amen Corner, E.C., 1916.

THIS volume is the complement of Part XI., and contains official and

private documents only. 'Most of them illustrate the period from Septimius Severus to Constantine; the others belong to the earlier period of Roman domination in Egypt.'

The first two sections are the most important: Edicts and Circular Letters, and documents of the Senate of Oxyrhynchus. In 1405, a person nomin-

ated to a liturgy offers to cede his property to the fiscus instead of performing the duty; but this the emperors declined, awarding the property to the nominator, and laying on him the duty. No. 1411 is a complete letter from a Strategus ordering the banks to accept the imperial coinage, apparently that of the usurpers Macrianus and Quietus; no doubt it had been debased.

In the documents concerning the Senate of Oxyrhynchus we have a vivid picture of some of the proceedings, besides new information of interest. Thus 1412 is a notice of a special general meeting summoned by the prytanis, who had hitherto been supposed to be the summoner but without direct evidence. The notes on this number contain a detailed discussion of several titles and the rank of municipal officials. Nos. 1413-16 are reports of proceedings of the Senate. The debate was opened by reading of a letter or by some introductory speech by the prytanis; the members' remarks appear to be summarised, as they are often sorted by sections or collective. Sometimes the senators exclaim, ὦ κεανέ, Πτολεμαῖε—Bravo, Ptolemaeus! and the like: this curious expletive has been found before, and is interpreted by the context. They discuss who shall be nominated for certain offices, and the members express their satisfaction that someone else has been named by crying, ἀγνὲ πιστὲ Φιλέα, ἀγνὲ πιστὲ Πλουτεῖνε! αἰὲ καλῶς Νεῖλος, βοήθειαν αὐτῷ! This chorus is quite comic. When they approve of the prytanis, they cry out, ἀτίμητε πρύτανι, σώζου ἡμῖν πρύτανι, καλῶς ἄρχεις· ἐπιεικῶς ὁ πρύτανις.

There are several reports of trials, unfortunately not complete, and orders and letters of officials; one is struck by the enormous numbers of public offices, and wonders what the people

did besides work and pay their innumerable taxes, which are of course the direct subject of many items. Poll-tax, pig-tax, acreage-tax, baths, desert guards, asses, embankments, crown-dues, temple-dues—life in Egypt must have been like life in the Turkish empire, except that if there was a road-tax we may assume that there were roads: the Turks exact the tax and leave the roads alone. It is impossible to summarise the many topics that occur, but we may mention the learned notes on dating and on the artaba, with the minute fractions not only of land but of στιχάρια and πάλλια (1448, the second of its kind).

No. 1449 is a list of votive offerings, with the givers' names. No. 1451 is an epicrisis of Roman citizens and slaves; one of an important class of documents, which are all fragmentary, but help to complete each other. This document is noteworthy as including the epicrisis of a girl along with her brother, which shows that the object of the examination cannot have been all military. This point is carefully discussed in this and the next number. No. 1453 is the earliest extant papyrus of the Roman period (B.C. 30-29).

A section is given to petitions, one being a petition for the *ius trium liberorum* (1467), the right to act without a guardian, especially if the petitioner can write. No. 1473 throws light on the marriage laws. Section VIII., Horoscopes and Charms, contains an important astronomical essay by Dr. J. K. Fotheringham. No. 1478 is a list of questions put to an oracle. The private letters are all worth reading; four of them are Christian, and amongst the earliest Christian documents from Egypt.

On the whole, this is one of the most interesting volumes of the series, although it has no literary pieces.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

TWO ROMAN TOWNS.

Aquae Sextiae: Histoire d'Aix-en-Provence dans l'antiquité. By MICHEL CLERC. 10" x 6½". One vol. Pp. 576, with 42 plates, and 24 figures in text. Aix-en-Provence: A. Dragon.

A Study of Tibur, Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Roman Empire (Johns Hopkins University dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy). By ELLA BOURNE. 9½" x 6½". One vol. Pp. 75. The Collegiate Press, George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin, 1916.

THESE two works present a strong contrast. The former is the work of a local archaeologist, who has made a minute and exhaustive study of the remains of his native town and district, and concerns himself mainly with the interpretation of material evidence. The latter is a compilation 'based on references to Tibur in Greek and Latin authors, and on the inscriptions found in the region of Tibur'; and, as the authoress explicitly informs us, 'topographical questions have been carefully avoided or referred to only incidentally.' It may therefore be dealt with very briefly. Miss Bourne has been at pains to collect literary allusions to Tibur, and seems to have allowed few, if any, to escape her. It is a little strange, however, to find Appian quoted in a Latin translation; and the metrical inscription cited for Fabricius on p. 72 is identical with Bücheler, *Carm. Epigr.* 871, which Miss Bourne treats as distinct. The chapters on the government and cults of Tibur contain a digest of what has been deduced, mainly from the inscriptions, with regard to these matters; but our knowledge can hardly be said to be materially advanced. The municipal institutions of Tibur, in fact, must remain in tantalising obscurity until further finds bring light. Miss Bourne argues on p. 43 for praetors at Tibur (never mentioned in inscriptions) on the ground that they are found at Praeneste; but the force of the argument is diminished by the fact that censors are found at Tibur, but not at

Praeneste, which shows that it is not entirely 'reasonable to assume a similarity between the governments of two States, the history of which was so closely connected.'

M. Clerc's book—a striking proof of the determination of French scholars not to suffer the 'present distress' to impede their labours—deserves the careful study of all who are concerned with Roman Gaul, and, for that matter, pre-Roman Gaul, since the early chapters deal at length with the *oppida*, which we may attribute to the Salluvii, and the remarkable sculptures of Antremont and La Roquepertuse, excellently reproduced on Plates III. ff. The principal merit of the book, however, consists in its luminous and convincing exposition of the results to be obtained by the study of the Roman remains found in or near Aix. Thus the evidence of the boundary-stones is carefully scrutinised in order to determine the limits of the *territorium* assigned to Aquae Sextiae—a question of importance, inasmuch as it affects the attribution of the inscriptions discovered in this region. Every inscription in the *Corpus* thus formed is reproduced by photography, and the texts are also collected; we could wish that these were accompanied by a fuller bibliography, but, except for this, M. Clerc gives us all the apparatus which we need for an epigraphic history of Aquae Sextiae. It is to be noted that M. Clerc rejects the Greek inscriptions said to come from Aix as 'certainly imported from abroad.' One of these is the well-known epitaph of Proclus (perhaps the consul of A.D. 238), now in the British Museum; and though we should not venture to disagree with M. Clerc, we should have been glad of some statement of the reasons for this judgment, especially as the inscription is assigned to Aix by Mr. Marshall in the recently published volume of the *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* (No. 1,106).

The most interesting feature in M. Clerc's book is his examination of the evidence relating to the ancient towers incorporated in the Palace of the Counts of Provence, the destruction of which in

1778-1786 was one of the most atrocious acts of vandalism perpetrated in modern times. M. Clerc's treatment of the documents, plans, drawings, etc., deserves study as a model of archaeological method, and he has placed his conclusions practically beyond dispute. Two of the three towers—the Tour du Trésor and the Tour du Chaperon—flanked a monumental gateway doubtless erected when Aquae Sextiae acquired the status of a *colonia* under the Julio-Claudian dynasty; the third—the Tour de l'Horloge—was a private mausoleum belonging to the time of Hadrian. M. Clerc seems fully justified in regarding a curious drawing by Giuliano da San Gallo, who visited Provence in 1494-

1496, as an attempted restoration of the buildings, of which the two first-named formed part, although the legend on the drawing shows that San Gallo confused Grasse with Aix.

For the rest, it may suffice to mention M. Clerc's eminently critical handling of the Christian inscriptions of Aix, notably the important sarcophagi of La Gayole, one of which has been supposed to be that of the poet Ennodius, but, as M. Clerc shows, on insufficient grounds. It is, however, to be regretted that illustrations of these monuments (apart from their inscriptions) could not be provided.

H. STUART JONES.

HOUSMAN'S MANILIUS, BOOK III.

M. Manilii Astronomicon, Liber Tertius.

Recensuit et enarravit A. E. HOUSMAN. Pp. xxviii + 72. London: Grant Richards. 1916. 4s. 6d. net.

I MUST apologise at the outset for a review, not only very late but somewhat slight, of a book which I should have liked to praise both early and with a better apprehension of it. I may plead in excuse the malice of the times and an occupation not favourable to humane studies.

There are five books of the *Astronomica*. Mr. Housman has now edited three of them; and there seems a fair chance that before the war is over (if both the war and Mr. Housman maintain their settled pace) he will have given us a complete edition of Manilius, and have added to scholarship a work that must ultimately take rank among the great monuments of Latin learning. I do not use these last words without weighing them, nor will a scholar who is not afraid (p. xiv) to pen a sentence beginning 'Neither Scaliger nor Salmاسius nor I' . . . suspect me of the wish to flatter him. I use them because I feel pretty sure that English scholars have in general very little idea how considerable a work Mr. Housman's *Manilius* is. While I am not prepared to go so far as Mr. Housman himself and to rank his work with that of Scaliger, I none the less feel that it is in the tradition of Scaliger; and I do

not think that any similar work of equal distinction has appeared in this country since Bentley.

Book III.—since I am dealing with that and not with general compliment—illustrates Mr. Housman's true qualities better, I think, than anything he has hitherto produced. I say his 'true qualities': for he is best known by qualities which are superficial only, those seen for example in the Introduction to Book I.—a piece of work brilliant, facile, provoking, well worth reading, scarcely worth writing. The Introduction to Book III. may be regarded as an apology for that to Book I. Nothing could be more austere—I had almost said more depressing. Here you may learn what the *Athla* are, and how to apply the circle of them to that of the signs; how to find the horoscope; what a stade is (with some hints on systems of daylight saving); what are the years of man; and much else that has interest only as part of the history of human delusion. All this is expounded with great clearness; and, correcting both Manilius and his editors, Mr. Housman marshals an array of astrological material which no other editor has been able to dispose to like effect. I think it certain that no previous editor of Manilius, and no previous writer upon ancient astrology, has understood this book so well.

When we turn from the Introduction to the text and notes, we find that the

value of these is in exact proportion to the labour spent upon understanding the subject-matter expounded in the Introduction. In some respects the text and notes evidence, I think, as compared with Books I. and II., a falling off. Not a great many of the emendations proposed in the text have, to my mind, that *πειθανάγκη* which so often distinguishes Mr. Housman's critical conjectures. Yet I have mostly the feeling that, if they do not hit the truth, they are hammering patiently round it; whereas I have thought in the past that Mr. Housman was apt from impatience merely to knock holes in the wall.¹ In the notes again, which accompany the text, there are fewer of the wide-ranging Lachmannian order, sweeping the whole field of Latin literature to establish a proposition in grammar, language, orthography, criti-

¹ It is refreshing to see Mr. Housman now and again confessing himself beaten in emendation, e.g. 121. Occasional emendations seem to be in his 'early bad manner.' What probability, for example, at p. 94 has *exciunt vicibus* for *eius in exemplum*? Of what I think are new emendations the most attractive is perhaps *librae* at 649.

cism (I am thinking of notes like that on 401). Citations of parallels are less apt than often. The very Latin of the editor's notes has lost something of its old force and individuality. Yet the notes as a whole have the character of high scholarship for the mere reason that they are based on a wide and masterly apprehension of a tiresome and intricate subject. Let me add that they are throughout almost impeccably polite—the occasional snappish impertinences which once so much delighted those who were not their object are absent.

The critical presuppositions of Mr. Housman's text remain unaltered. Unlike the Dutch editor of the new Teubner text, he still believes in the independent authority of the *Codex Gemblacensis*; and he assigns to the *Venetius* no more importance than, I think, it deserves. The notes on 374 and 399-400 suggest reflections upon the exemplars from which our extant MSS. are derived, which I wish that Mr. Housman could find time to amplify.

H. W. GARROD.

OBITUARY

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE ruthlessness of our enemies, unrestrained by moral scruples or humane principles, has taken from us a great scholar. The ship in which Dr. Moulton was returning from India was sunk in the Mediterranean on April 7, 1917. On the fourth day he died from exposure and was buried at sea. He was only fifty-three, and the foul blow which has sent him to his premature death has robbed us of much which he had planned to give us.

After a distinguished career at Cambridge and the University of London, he became tutor at Didsbury College, Manchester, in 1902, and my acquaintance with him dates from that time. He was appointed lecturer on the New Testament in the University of Manchester, when the Faculty of Theology was

formed in 1904; and two or three years later he became Greenwood Professor of Hellenistic Greek and Indo-European Philology.

As a scholar he gained eminence in two subjects, the Grammar of the New Testament, and Zoroastrianism. The two were not so far apart as they might seem. It was not merely that both belonged to the domain of religion. That counted for much with Moulton; indeed, he could have made his own the words, "O Lord, by these things men live, And wholly therein is the life of my spirit." But while religion always claimed from him loving and sympathetic treatment, the selection of his special fields of research grew naturally out of his classical studies. His interest in Comparative Philology led him from Latin and

Greek to Sanscrit and Iranian, at which he worked under the guidance of Cowell, and from the language he passed to the religion of the Avesta. His father's labours on Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, which he had not merely translated but enriched, gave him an hereditary inclination to that subject. But his philological training gave him the qualification for taking up singlehanded the task of rewriting the *Grammar* as an independent work, which at first he hoped to accomplish in co-operation with his father.

His Zoroastrian studies are represented, apart from articles, by his *Early Religious Poetry of Persia* and his massive Hibbert Lectures on *Early Zoroastrianism*. The latter are not easy for those who have not already some knowledge of the subject; they are his contribution to a debate of experts. The experts valued the book highly. The annotated translation of the Gathas forms a specially welcome feature of it; and classical students will turn with interest to his notes on the extracts translated from Greek authors. The Biblical student ought not to overlook the chapter on 'Zarathushtra and Israel' or the Appendix on 'The Magian Material of Tobit.' He went to India that he might study the religion of the Parsees, as it is believed and practised by its adherents. Whether his book on this subject is in a condition to be published I do not know; but I understand that a series of lectures on Zoroastrianism delivered to the Parsee community has been issued in India, and I presume will be made accessible to English readers.

He won a much wider fame by the first volume of his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, containing the Prolegomena, which was published in 1906. It applied to the Grammar what Deissmann had sought to establish for the Vocabulary. A glance at a volume of Greek papyri had suggested to Deissmann that New Testament Greek was not to be placed in a class by itself (the special language of the Holy Ghost, as it was sometimes called), but was just the ordinary spoken language of the day, the current non-literary Greek. Moulton deleted 'Hebraic Greek' from his earlier definition of it. The theory has naturally met with

criticism, especially on the question of Semitism in the New Testament. For what he had to say in reply I select for mention his contribution to the *Cambridge Biblical Essays*. The *Prolegomena* won instant recognition. Deissmann was enthusiastic. Harnack in the fourth of his *Beiträge* (p. 2) pronounced Moulton 'der beste Kenner des NTlichen Griechisch.' The University of Berlin made him a Doctor of Theology. The book was translated, with considerable additions, into German under Thumb's auspices, none too well as Thumb bluntly said in his Preface. It has left its mark on much of the exegetical and philological literature published on the New Testament and the Septuagint in recent years. The second volume is in the press; how much, if any, of the third volume, that on the Syntax, has been written I cannot at present say. In collaboration with Professor Milligan he planned a comprehensive work entitled the *Vocabulary of the New Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*, and two of its six parts have been issued. Whether Deissmann's Lexicon to the New Testament will ever be published is uncertain, but in happier days it was arranged that Moulton should prepare an English edition of it.

To those of us who were bound to him by ties of intimate friendship and deep-rooted affection, who laboured with him in a common task and felt a wholehearted admiration for the man and his work, his premature death, and under such circumstances, is a bitter loss. Straight, clean, magnanimous, generous, unselfish, and free from littleness and jealousy, he was a friend and colleague in whom one could wholly trust. Virile in character and of irreproachable integrity, he was womanly in his tenderness, full of sympathy for the suffering and of gentleness to the weak. His ample and varied learning raised no barrier between him and the illiterate, and the ministry he delighted to render them was neither spoiled by condescension nor chilled by aloofness. He could and sometimes did hit hard in controversy, but never below the belt. He had, like the rest of us, his intellectual limitations. In his case it was especially his unsym-

pathetic attitude towards philosophy, and perhaps one might add an occasional tendency to fancifulness in his treatment of history. But his range was

wide and on his own ground he was a great master.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE BRITISH ACADEMY.

CROMER GREEK PRIZE.

WITH the view of maintaining and encouraging the study of Greek, particularly among the young, in the national interest, Lord Cromer has founded an annual prize, to be administered by the British Academy, for the best essay on any subject connected with the language, history, art, literature, or philosophy of Ancient Greece.

The second annual prize, of £40, will be awarded in March, 1918, under the following rules:

1. Competition is open to all British subjects of either sex who will be under twenty-six years of age on December 31, 1917.

2. Any such person desirous of competing must send in to the Secretary of the British Academy on or before June 1, 1917, the title of the subject proposed by him or her. The Academy may approve (with or without modification) or disapprove the subject; their decision will be intimated to the competitor as soon as possible.

3. Preference will be given, in approval of subjects proposed, to those which deal with aspects of the Greek genius and civilisation of large and permanent significance over those which are of a minute or highly technical character.

4. Any essay already published, or already in competition for another prize of the same nature, will be inadmissible.

5. Essays of which the subject has been approved must be sent in to the Secretary of the Academy on or before December 31, 1917. They must be typed (or, if the author prefers, printed), and should have a note attached stating the main sources of information used.

6. It is recommended that the essays should not exceed 20,000 words, exclusive of notes. Notes should not run to an excessive length.

7. The author of the essay to which the prize is awarded will be expected to publish it (within a reasonable time and after any necessary revision), either separately, or in the journals or transactions of a society approved by the Academy, or among the transactions of the Academy.

The Secretary of the Academy will supply on application, to any person qualified and desirous to compete, a list which has been drawn up of some typical subjects, for general guidance only, and without any suggestion that one or another of these subjects should be chosen, or that preference will be given to them over any other subject of a suitable nature.

Communications should be addressed to 'The Secretary of the British Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London, W.'

AN important Conference of University representatives with Secondary School teachers of the North-Eastern Counties took place in Newcastle-upon-Tyne on March 17. The Conference had been arranged by the Secondary Schools Examining Board of the University of Durham, with a view to securing closer co-operation between the University and schools in regard to the ground covered during the earlier stages of the University curriculum and that covered during the last years at school. The scheme is that for every subject common to University and schools a Standing Committee should be formed, consisting of the University teachers concerned and five representatives of boys' and girls' schools; and that these Standing Committees should meet periodically and consider questions of teaching and examination in their respective subjects, while general Conferences between University teachers and all the school teachers concerned should meet at least

annually to elect such Standing Committees and receive their reports.

The Classical Section of the Conference met under the chairmanship of Professor J. Wight Duff, D.Litt., and elected its Standing Committee—viz. Dr. R. B. Hepple, Westoe Secondary School, South Shields; Miss Lodge, Collegiate Girls' School, Sunderland; Mr. H. N. Smith, Royal Grammar School, Newcastle; Miss Taylor, Central High School, Newcastle; Mr. Widdows, Whitley and Monkseaton High School for Boys.

After discussion two matters were referred to the Committee:

(a) The question of which authors in Latin and in Greek should in the regulations for the proposed 'eighteen year old' school examination be recommended for study from the standpoint of literary and historical significance, it being understood that at the stage of this higher examination no books should be specifically prescribed.

(b) The collection of data regarding the teaching of oral Latin with a view to the discussion of the subject at a future Conference of classical teachers in the north of England.

AFTER the Annual General Meeting of the Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association, held in Newcastle on March 10, the Rev. Canon Cruickshank, Professor of Greek in the University of Durham, read a paper on 'Some Classical Parallels to the Dun Cow Legend.' The basis of this famous legend associated with Durham Cathedral was examined and illustrated by evidence from the Classics and from folklore bearing upon the part played by animals in accounts of the foundation of cities and shrines. The paper stimulated an interesting discussion, to which contributions were made by Dr. J. Wight Duff, who presided, Miss Hiley, Mr. James Thomson and Mr. C. H. Blair. The speakers touched on a wide range of illustrations drawn from mythology, prodigies, numismatics, sphragistics, pagan elements in Christian art, and

the relation of pastures to primitive settlements.

THE LIBRARY OF LOUVAIN.

MORE than two years ago the members of the Classical Association were invited to offer books which might in due course be given to the Library of Louvain. The response was generous.

A year later the Association sent delegates to a meeting called on the initiative of the British Academy, and presided over by Viscount Bryce, at which a committee was appointed to consider and co-ordinate various projects for the collection of books for Louvain. The secretary of this committee is Mr. Hugh Butler, Librarian of the House of Lords.

It is now proposed to hand over the offers which were received in answer to the Association's appeal to Mr. Butler, who will have the books sent to the Rylands Library, Manchester, there to be catalogued and stored until the time arrives for their despatch to Louvain. It will be assumed that this course is approved by all the members concerned, unless any of them give notice to the contrary before the end of May to Mr. E. Harrison, Trinity College, Cambridge, to whom the offers were sent in the first place.

BOOKS BY THE LATE MR. HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE Council of the Classical Association wishes to announce that an arrangement has been made by which copies of four classical books by the late Mr. Herbert Richards, of Wadham College, Oxford—an original member of the Association—may, on application to the publishers, be obtained both by members of the Classical Association and by the Libraries which take in its publications at a considerably reduced price—viz. 2s. 6d. per volume, exclusive of postage. The books in question are: *Notes on Xenophon and Others*, *Aristophanes and Others*, *Platonica*, *Aristotelica*. They are the work of a former contributor to the *Review*, and embody material which made there its first appearance.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—My friend Dr. J. M. Keegan, R.A.M.C., has suggested to me that the moulding of the abdominal region of the 'Venus' of Milo points to imperfect uterine contraction, thus showing that a child had but recently been born, and he would reconstruct the statue as holding an infant up in its arms. This view is, as far as I know, new; he would explain the robe, so uncomfortably and restlessly on the

point of slipping down, as so arranged to display the muscular study; though, at first thought, the hypothesis that the figure grasped with its left hand the top of a shield, the bottom of which rested on the robe on the projecting left thigh, would seem more satisfactory. The question of date remains, from what I make of it, as obscure as ever.—I am, Sirs, yours, etc.,

J. C. HOWE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Appleton (R. B.) *Perse Latin Plays*. Second Edition. 7½" × 5". Pp. 68. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1917. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Box (G. A.) *The Apocalypse of Ezra* (2 Esdras iii.-xiv.). *Palestinian Jewish Texts*. 7½" × 5". Pp. 116. London: S.P.C.K., 1917. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Carpenter (R.) *The Ethics of Euripides*. 10" × 6½". Oxford University Press (for Columbia University Press), 1916. 2s. 6d. net.

Chase (G. H.) *Catalogue of Aretine Pottery*. 13½" × 8½". Pp. viii + 112, with 30 plates. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916. Half cloth, \$2.50.

De Sanctis (G.) *Storia dei Romani*. Vol. III.: *L'Eta delle Guerre Puniche*. Two Parts. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 24 + 432 and vii + 728, with 9 coloured maps. Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1917. L. 30.

Freeman (C. E.) and Lowe (W. D.) *A Greek Reader for Schools*. 7½" × 5". Pp. iv + 142. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1917. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Gigthis. *Étude d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, sur un Emporium de la Petite Syrie*. Avec 14 planches hors texte et 3 figures dans le texte (Extraits des Nouvelles Archives des Missions scientifiques, 14^e fasc.). 10" × 6¾". Pp. 116. Paris: É. Leroux, 1916.

Ingram Bywater. *The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar*. By W. W. Jackson. 9½" × 6". Pp. xii + 212. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1917. 7s. 6d. net.

Legrand (P. E.) *The New Greek Comedy*. Translated by J. Loeb. 9" × 5¾". Pp. xx + 547. London: W. Heinemann, 1917. Cloth, 15s. net.

Livy (Book XXIII.) Edited by A. G. Peskett. 6¾" × 4¾". Pp. xxiv + 160, with a map. Cambridge University Press, 1917. Cloth.

Loeb Classical Library: *Seneca's Tragedies* (F. J. Miller). Vol. I., pp. xvi + 568; Vol. II., pp. 542.—*The Greek Anthology* (W. R. Paton). Vol. II., pp. vi + 517.—*Strabo's Geography* (H. L. Jones). Vol. I., pp. xliii + 531.—*Achilles Tatius* (S. Gaselee). Pp. xvi + 461. 6¾" × 4¾". London: W. Heinemann, 1917. Cloth, 5s. net per vol.

Mendell (C. W.) *Latin Sentence Connection*. 8¾" × 6". Oxford University Press (for Yale University Press), 1917. Cloth, \$1.50 net.

Moore (C. H.) *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*. 8¾" × 5½". Pp. xii + 385. Cambridge University Press (for Harvard University Press), 1916. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Roberts (W. Rhys). *Greek Civilisation as a Study for the People*. *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. III. 10" × 6". Pp. 13. Oxford University Press, 1917. 1s. net.

Sophocles (Fragments). Edited, with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam, by A. C. Pearson. Three Vols. 9" × 5½". Vol. I., pp. c + 270; Vol. II., pp. vi + 332; Vol. III., pp. x + 350. Cambridge University Press, 1917. Cloth, 45s. net.

Weatherhead (T. C.) *Exercises on Rules for Latin Prose*. Pp. xii + 192. 2s. 6d. net.—*Further Rules for Latin Prose*. Pp. xii + 108. 2s. net.—*Biennium Latinum*. Pp. viii + 146. 2s. 6d. net. 7½" × 5". Cambridge University Press, 1917. Half cloth.

ALTERATION IN PRICE.—Owing to the increase in the cost of materials, the price of cases for binding volumes of the CLASSICAL REVIEW is advanced to 2s. 6d. These may be obtained from any bookseller; postage 4d. extra.

